

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. LIV, No. 18
WHOLE No. 1374

February 8, 1936

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS —Note and Comment.....	413-417
TOPICS OF INTEREST: The Snob and the Saint by G. K. Chesterton—The Higher Reaches by Elizabeth Sehlstedt—The Last Stuart by Cuthbert Wright—Catholic Action Coordinated by James D. Loeffler, S.J.	418-424
POETRY: Remembered—Candlemas—The Undiscerning Years.....	419; 425; 429
SOCIOLOGY: The New General-Welfare Clause by Paul L. Blakely, S.J.....	424-425
EDUCATION: Reverence for the Child by Cricket Wainscott	426-427
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF by The Pilgrim	427-428
LITERATURE: Poland's Prophet of the Resurrection by John LaFarge, S.J.....	428-429
REVIEWS OF BOOKS ..430-432.. COMMUNICATIONS ..432-433.. CHRONICLE ..	434-436

The Fruits of Extortion

LIKE Federal Prohibition, the bonus bill, passed over the President's veto, is an example of what can be done by an organized minority. Last year President Roosevelt stated one part of the case against the bill when he said that an obligation due in 1945 could not possibly be due in 1935. In using the word *obligation*, the President conceded too much, for the payments now to be made do not in any sense represent an obligation in justice. They are simply the fruits of extortion.

For the sake of the record, and as a possible shield in the future, the reasons which the President gave last year for his veto may be repeated. First, the bill fails to provide additional taxes to take care of expenditures which will amount to a little less than three and one-half billions of dollars. The theory which Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, seems to think perfectly satisfactory, that these bounties can be paid through "baby bonds," which will impose no burden, is simply drivell. Who is going to pay for these bonds? The Government cannot pull the money out of a hat. It can only pull it out of the pockets of the people. The costs can be paid only by heavier taxation.

In the next place, as the President said a year ago, payment of a bounty in advance of 1945, will not only be a complete repudiation of the agreement solemnly made in 1924, but "nothing less than a new straight gratuity." Congress has now given that gratuity, but not the gratuity fixed last year in the Patman bill. The new gratuity is larger by nearly a billion dollars.

At the close of his 1935 veto, the President adduced reasons of even greater import. To argue for the bill as a relief measure was to indulge in the fallacy "that the welfare of the country can be generally served by extending relief on some basis other than actual deserving need."

That fallacy is embodied in the new Act of Congress. Billions will be poured out, as soon as more than 3,000 clerks, working under the direction of the Treasury, can prepare the necessary papers, and the recipients will be the wealthy as well as the needy. The President also pointed out that the credit of the United States cannot possibly be sustained, when Congress yields "to each and all of the groups that are able to force upon Congress claims for special consideration." Such yielding would destroy popular government and "put in its place government by and for political coercion by minorities." Congress has done all that it can do for the present to affirm the principle laid down by the President. Finally, the President feared that the enactment of this bill by Congress would be followed by a demand for the enactment of a general pension system. The President's apprehensions are verified, for two bills now pending before Congress propose pensions for the widows of veterans, irrespective of the cause of the veteran's death.

Every one of the President's reasons for vetoing the bill is conclusive. If it be asked, then, why Congress has authorized the bonus, the only answer that can be given is that only a minority of the members of either House have the courage to call their souls their own. The complete breakdown of Congress in face of this organized minority which for fifteen years has been looting the Treasury and imposing new burdens on the whole people, is the most disturbing fact in this whole miserable campaign.

Ordinarily, an expenditure of three billions of dollars by Congress would not endanger the credit of the country. It would not, probably, endanger it even today, were the billions expended for a necessary public purpose. But what faith can the country put in a Congress which opens the public purse not for a public purpose but to defend

itself against the threats of an organized and truculent minority? On January 1, 1930, the public debt was approximately sixteen billion dollars. Six years later, it was more than twenty-eight billion dollars. At the order of a minority, Congress has now added more than three billions, and has practically authorized a pension system the costs of which no man can foresee.

It is difficult to speak with restraint of the Congress which has so shamefully disregarded its obligations to the country. No misrepresentation can be charged, however, when one of its own most prominent members is cited to speak for it. On January 18, the floor leader in the Senate, Senator Byrnes, said:

When you tie it [the old Patman bill] to this bill, the veterans of the United States will again be put off. They will meet under the flag, and holler and moan another year for their bonus.

No words could state the apostasy of Congress more clearly. The bonus was not voted for reasons that can be justified, but because veterans would "holler and moan," if it were not voted. In craven fear of what might happen at the polls next November, Congress took the money of the people, and turned it over to an organized minority.

The worst of this campaign is not that the people have been looted, but that a faithless Congress has set an example for more looting by future Congresses. The one ray of hope in it all is that the bonus may possibly help to keep us out of war. In the United States a war does not cost much while it is going on. The real costs begin about one year after it has ended. They increase thereafter, through the favor of one spineless Congress after another, in geometrical progression.

Contempt of Court

WHEN the Supreme Court held the Agricultural Act unconstitutional, three of the Justices dissented. Under the Act about \$200,000,000, collected as a processing tax, had been impounded, pending final ruling. The question then arose as to whom this money should be returned. On this, there was no dissent. By unanimous vote the Court ordered it returned to those from whom it had been directly collected.

Both opinions displease the Secretary of Agriculture. In a radio address over a national network on January 28, he characterized the unanimous opinion in language which while common in Communist circles, is rarely heard from a member of the Cabinet. "I believe—as did the minority in the Hoosac Mills case—that the Constitution means what it says." But he does not believe with this minority, plus the majority, when it decided that money collected by a tax held to be unconstitutional must be returned. That decision constitutes, said the Secretary, "the greatest legalized steal in American history."

Secretary Wallace might well follow the example of the dissenters in the Agricultural Act case. It may be assumed that these three Justices, although they believed the Act to be constitutional, had no idea that the return of the impounded tax to the processors was a "steal" which the Court could make legal. Had that been their

opinion, they would have entered another dissent. Had they not thought that this solution of an admittedly complex question was in every way proper, they would not have voted as they did.

Perhaps it might have been better had the Court obliged every processor to show that he had not passed the tax on to the consumer. The Court, however, took the view that since the tax was illegal, and since, further, it had undoubtedly been paid by certain known individuals, nothing could be done except to give it back to these known individuals. But the Secretary may find consolation in the thought that the new taxes which cannot be long deferred, will probably take that \$200,000,000 away from them.

The example of the justices who dissented in the AAA case, but in the subsequent processing case accepted the Court's decision, may well serve as a model to Secretary Wallace. The public has a right to demand that officials sworn to support the Constitution shall not fail in respect to the Constitution's authoritative interpreter.

Profitable Neutrality

THE one profitable type of neutrality is the neutrality which begins as soon as war is declared, and automatically creates an embargo on all goods to be sold to any belligerent. Neutrality which bids the President pick and choose between belligerents, and allows trade with the alleged innocent parties, may bring an immediate profit in dollars. It also brings us war, which destroys the former profit, as far as the country is concerned, and loads every American citizen with a new burden of debt.

That was precisely the effect of the permissive neutrality which President Wilson tried twenty years ago. When we balance dollars against neutrality, we get neither. What we get is war.

Discussing neutrality at a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association in New York some weeks ago, W. W. Cumberland, formerly of the War Trade Board, assumed a position which, in our judgment, is both dangerous, and, unfortunately, common. Mr. Cumberland is correct in holding that if trade with belligerents is morally permissible, "no distinctions can be made as between arms and munitions, credits and war materials." Thus if we permit the sale of wheat and cotton, it will be hard to find a reason that is convincing for putting the embargo on munition makers and international bankers. But from what we take to be the import of Mr. Cumberland's conclusion, we must sharply dissent. "The policy of the United States toward such wars should be based on enlightened self-interest."

From one point of view, this looks like begging the question. What is "enlightened self-interest"? Senator Nye answers that it is a mandatory embargo. Senator Pittman holds that it is an embargo tempered at the discretion of the President. As it seems to us, what Mr. Cumberland means is "business as usual, even during war," and while Senator Pittman will disclaim the inference, we cannot escape the conclusion that his bill means

the same thing. How business can be carried on as usual without incurring hostility from one or other of the belligerents is a question that has not been answered.

No nation at war has yet admitted, or will ever admit, that it is the aggressor. It will not be forced to that admission by a Presidential proclamation distinguishing between aggressors and aggrieved, and making rulings on "normal" shipments. What it will conclude is that it has another enemy, to be dealt with as soon as this war is ended.

Neutrality will cost us money. But it will cost us far less than war. If we want neutrality we must be prepared to forego the immediate profits that might arise from trade with any belligerent. But we must have a real neutrality, and not a document which encourages us to open the shop door for one belligerent, and slam it in the face of another.

In the Name of Eugenics

WHATEVER may be said of liberty, it is certain that crime is committed in the name of statistics. Statisticians themselves are worthy folk. If they are falling into disfavor, it is not for their own sins, but because of their friends, who substitute for science a kind of numerology which can recall the past, reveal the present, and forecast the future. These are the gentry who, as the *New York Times* remarks in a recent editorial on sterilization, revel in "statistical gossip."

No topic has been discussed more frequently in our State legislatures during the last decade than sterilization. Wherever the subject is dragged in, a cloud of statistics is sure to darken the sun. Legislators, many of whom gained their knowledge of science from the Sunday supplements, stun our ears with dogmatic pronouncements on heredity, race culture, and other matters, about which honest investigators confess doubt or complete ignorance. Thus is the common mind deceived, for reports signed by scientists are usually too dull to win the attention of the public.

One point, however, is certain, and that is that the sterilization laws of our States are not based on the tested conclusions of science. Last year, the British Departmental Committee on Sterilization reported that, in view of how little is known of heredity, laws providing for the sterilization of the supposedly "unfit" could have no justification in science. More recently, a committee of the American Neurological Association, working under a grant from the Carnegie Foundation, made a study of sterilization, with particular reference to its supposed effect in checking the spread of mental diseases and of feeble-mindedness. Its conclusions are substantially those of the British Committee. As the *Times* observes, until we learn more about the subject, "it is simply folly to place on the books laws which reflect the good intentions of enthusiasts rather than the findings of sober biologists."

A common argument for sterilization laws is an emotional picture of this country completely overrun by Nams, Jukes, and Kallikaks. The picture has no warrant from

what we know of the facts. As a rule, psychotic individuals are not so fertile as the general population, and the death rate among them is higher. Again, the offspring of mentally handicapped parents may be normal, while definitely feeble-minded children may be born of parents classed above the mental average. From whatever angle the problem is viewed, no argument valid in science can be offered to sustain sterilization laws.

Yet twenty-five States have enacted this legislation. A number of other States followed suit, but the statutes were rejected by the local courts. In twenty-five States, the law affects feeble-minded, insane, and epileptic subjects; in ten, habitual sex offenders; and in two, habitual criminals. In most of the States the law is practically inoperative. Of about 16,000 operations registered up to the end of 1934, more than half were performed in one State, California. However, a survey conducted by the United Press shows that the law was enforced in about 4,000 cases in 1935, which would indicate a sharp rise in the rate.

In discussing sterilization, a distinction of vital importance must be drawn. Does the law affect both criminals and the mentally defective, or is it restricted to the first class? It may indeed be plausibly argued that the state may sterilize a man actually guilty of crime, yet only when this is necessary to protect the common good. But it may not sterilize any one on the ground that at some future time he *may* become a criminal. Against this possibility, other measures may be taken; further, as Pius XI teaches in the Encyclical on Christian Marriage, "public magistrates have no direct power over the bodies of their subjects."

In no case, however, may the State sterilize anyone merely because he is "feeble-minded," a dangerous term, because of its vagueness, in criminal law, or because he is mentally sick. To quote Pius XI again, magistrates "can never directly harm or tamper with the integrity of the body, either for reasons of eugenics, or for any other reason." Sterilization is in these cases an unwarranted violation of human dignity, and the destruction of a right which man does not hold from the state, but from God.

The Youthful Criminal

SOME startling figures relating to youthful criminals have been released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The majority of criminals reported to the Government for the first three months of 1935 were nineteen years of age. Next in line are criminals in the twenty-two-year-old group, and they are followed by criminals who are twenty-one, twenty-three, eighteen, twenty-four, and twenty years of age. After the twenty-five-year mark, there is a decrease in the number of criminals.

These figures cover a restricted time period, but they show no great divergence from reports which have been filed during the last ten years. Too great reliance must not be placed upon them as evidence that crime is increasing or decreasing. Still, with all deductions made, they are startling enough. If the typical criminal in the United

States is just nineteen years old, it is plain that our plans for educating and training youth are not having their effect.

The boy whose name is found on the prison records by the time he is nineteen years old, probably began the courses which led him to prison not long after he reached the age of reason. In all probability, he came from a home broken by divorce, by the misconduct of one or both parents, or by destitution. Home, school, Church, and state must unite their efforts to prevent more of these wrecks. No one of them can successfully undertake the task.

The state can do its part by laws affecting industrial and economic problems, which will help the individual to live in keeping with his dignity as a child of God. But it has a further duty which in this country at least it ignores. It must also help parents, and agencies which they employ, to train the child in religion and in respect for a moral code based upon religion.

Note and Comment

The Literary Plebiscite

IS it possible that our readers failed to note that the closing of the polls for the election of the forty Catholic Immortals had been postponed until Saturday, February 29? Or is it possible that all who had the desire to cast a vote for the best fifteen American Catholic authors and the best twenty-five foreign Catholic authors, have actually fulfilled their desire and have actually cast their votes? Is it possible that there are not some shy, hesitant, dilatory thousands who would like to cast a vote but have not brought themselves to the sticking point, of sticking their votes in envelopes, sticking the envelopes and sticking the stamps? The voting has fallen off during the past week. The polls, nevertheless, are open still, and every letter postmarked before or on February 29, of all days, will be counted in the plebiscite.

National List: Legion of Decency

HIGHLY desirable was the unification of the program of the National Legion of Decency effected by the Bishops of the United States at the last November meeting. Some vagueness as to the authority of listing agencies operating on a national scale had heretofore existed. Through the corporate decision of the Bishops, the matter has been clarified. In behalf of the Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, O.P., Archbishop of Cincinnati, Chairman of the Bishops' Committee on Motion Pictures, a statement was issued by the Rev. Dr. Edward Roberts Moore that, after February 6, classified lists of motion pictures issued by the National Legion of Decency will be prepared for and circulated by the New York Archdiocesan Council. These lists will classify motion pictures according to moral standards alone, not according to art-excellence, interest, entertainment or educational values, etc. They

are intended "for the guidance of Catholic people," who have a serious obligation, positively imposed on them by their Bishops, of *not* viewing objectionable pictures. According to Dr. Moore, "the list is based on the objective and unvarying standards of Catholic morality and aims to supply such information about current motion pictures as may be necessary in order that subjects considered to be harmful to morality may be avoided." The responsibility of preparing such lists is great, even though the ratings are to be expressed negatively, as follows: A.1. Unobjectionable for general patronage; 2. Unobjectionable for adults. B. Objectionable in parts. C. Condemned. His Eminence, Cardinal Hayes, has undertaken, and will most efficiently organize, this work of a national listing. The Rev. Dr. Joseph A. Daly has been appointed the executive secretary. The New York Archdiocesan Council, composed of prominent Catholic laymen, created in 1934, has been entrusted with the duty of preparing and circulating the lists for use "by diocesan councils throughout the country." The previewing and grading of all the current motion pictures will be carried on by the Motion Picture Bureau of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, a committee that has proved itself eminently qualified for such a task through more than a dozen years of service in motion-picture classifications. With unity of listing thus effected through the decision of the Hierarchy, the sole problem of the National Legion of Decency has been satisfactorily solved.

For Church Unity

THE Church Unity Octave this year was celebrated with more than ordinary fervor in different parts of the United States. The tension of the times, and the wide publicity given to the statement of the Anglican "Church Unity Council in America," which pointed to Protestantism's declining churches and urged union in view of the "frightful menace" of a divided Christendom, contributed thereto. Under the auspices of the Saint Paul's Guild, the Octave was celebrated at the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola in New York City. Two of the eight priests who spoke on successive nights during this series, the Reverend Robert H. Lord, of Boston, and the Rev. Edward F. Hawks, of Philadelphia, are converts to the Catholic Faith, while the Rev. George Esterguard, of Big Stone City, S. Dak., who spoke on the fifth evening, is the son of a Norwegian convert from Lutheranism to Catholicism. Presiding in the sanctuary, at the closing session, was the Most Rev. Joseph H. Conroy, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Ogdensburg, who was Vicar General of New York Archdiocese when Father Paul James Francis, S.A., originator of the Octave and himself a convert from Anglicanism, was received into the Catholic Church. Father Paul was himself present on the closing night. The Octave calls definitely for the union of all Christians in prayer for this great end, and recalls that the Episcopal Bishops at their conference in Lambeth in 1920 declared: "We believe that the Holy Spirit has called us in a very solemn and special manner to as-

sociate ourselves in penitence and prayer with all those who deplore the division of Christian people, and are inspired by the vision and hope of a visible Unity of the whole Church."

Butter And Payrolls

SIR AUREL STEIN, the famous explorer and archaeologist, undertook to prove a direct relationship between the feed of yaks in Central Asia and the price of silver on the international market. Without going so far afield, Henry F. Grady, of the Department of State, speaking at the Northeastern Dairy Conference in Philadelphia on January 7 of this year, pointed out the intimate connection between fluctuations in the price of butter and the size of payrolls. This relationship was shown in a study published by the Department of Agriculture in August, 1931, entitled "The Outlook for the Dairy Industry." It showed that butter and payrolls sank together during the business recession of 1924 and in the severe decline in payrolls accompanying the preliminary depression of 1921 and the big one of 1929-30. "When recovery in business gets under way," observes the study, "and payrolls increase, it is to be expected that prices of butter will improve." Which of course will butter the dairymen's rolls, and will prove to the Department of State's satisfaction that dairymen should not be clamoring for tariffs on milk products. While all are waiting for this happy event, we may note that Father Nell, of Effingham, Ill., which is an island of Catholic social activity entirely surrounded by milk, believes that the only way that the dairymen of that region can get justice is by advocating voluntary occupational groups uniting the interests of producers, marketers, and consumers, in the spirit of *Quadragesimo Anno*. Since all need butter and all need pay, they might as well all agree to assist one another.

Our Lady and The Dog

STORIES about Our Lady and the birds are common, but it has been left to the research of the scholarly Father Herbert Thurston, S.J., to find us a story about Our Blessed Lady and a dog. The learned Jesuit unearthed it from an ancient Ethiopic manuscript, republished with others, under the editorship of Sir E. Wallis Budge, Keeper of Egyptian Antiquities at the British Museum. Here it is, as Father Thurston transcribes it in the *Dublin Review* for January.

Now one day there were two women with our Lady Mary, and a thirsty dog came between them, and they drove him away, but our Lady Mary was exceedingly grieved when she saw how thirsty he was, and she wept. And the women said to her, "Wilt thou be more merciful to this dog than we? Shall not Christ, who is called the Messiah, be born of thee?" Now when our holy Lady heard these words, great joy entered her heart. Then taking up her water pitcher, she went to a place some distance away, and having put off her shoes from her feet, she poured water into one of them, and gave the thirsty dog to drink. And one of the women said to her: "Why hast thou taken the water for him from thy pitcher? And if thy jar be broken thou wilt not find water elsewhere." Then Our Lady Mary answered and said unto

her: "The water is not that which cometh forth from a well, but from heaven, and God who hath given this thirsty dog water to drink gave it unto me from above."

The meaning of this last sentence, writes Father Thurston, "I suppose is that all good gifts come from God, and that we are just as much dependent on Him as the animals are." The narrator of the little story ends with a prayer.

Even though my sin exceedeth computation,
Remember, O my Lady, in thy gracious kindness
Him that is in sore straits,
Even as thou didst give the thirsty dog water to drink.

Are there other stories about Our Lady and the dog?

Parade Of Events

LITTLE men and little women burst forth into the new freedom. . . . Two women, each nine years old, abandoned their New York homes, began a long walk to Nebraska. . . . At the ferry they just missed a man, aged ten, on his way to fight for Ethiopia. He had run into passport difficulties; decided to return to Harlem for further thought just before the Nebraska-bound women took ship for Jersey. . . . As they walked through Jersey, an older woman—almost thirteen—passed them, headed for New York. She sought a new environment where she could forget the past. She had put down the wrong answers in a school examination. . . . A New England man, approaching his fifth year, warned by doctors to cut down on smoking, was heroically limiting himself to three cigars a day. . . . Another man, his fourth birthday already behind him, concluded he had seen enough of the world, committed suicide. . . . A Chicago woman, nearing nine, sent a hurry call to police to arrest the boy next door. He had a mean disposition, she told the officers. . . . Divergence in national mentalities were shown. . . . People in the United States read yearningly of the heat wave sweeping Brazil. Brazilians felt envious when they read of Hell freezing over in the United States. Hell is a town in Michigan. . . . Inaudible sound waves have a marked effect on potatoes, investigation showed. The use of inaudible sound waves in certain radio programs, though suggested, was opposed by broadcasters. . . . In the world of international affairs, termites were eating up the Finnish legation building in Washington, and a Jewish family in the Bronx, named Hittler, had its name changed.

AMERICA A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief
FRANCIS X. TALBOT
WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
Associate Editors
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager
PAUL L. BLAKELY
GERARD B. DONNELLY
JOHN LAFARGE
JOHN A. TOOMEY

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: MEadillon 3-3082
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

The Snob and the Saint

G. K. CHESTERTON

(Copyright, 1936)

THAT weird and wild and rather weak-minded thing which Father Ronald Knox calls the symposiast mind, and Arnold Lunn calls Fif, had a grand opportunity to gush freely in a daily paper not long ago, when a well-known journalist was required to draw up a sort of examination paper, or table of questions to be addressed to the representatives of various religious bodies.

In a general way, and without any particular resentment toward this particular inquisitor any more than to a million others, the questions were of a sort that strike us as strangely random and disconnected. It might be summed up by saying that this sort of inquirer always asks all sorts of people all sorts of questions; but never asks himself any questions. I can only suppose that the old custom of what was called self-examination, in moral matters, is now so much confined to Catholics that the others have altogether abandoned self-examination even in intellectual matters; nay, even in practical matters.

The very last thing that seems to occur to such a heckler is the very first thing that ought to occur to any human being. It is simply to ask, "What do I want?", even before going on to the deeper and darker problem of "Why do I want it?"

In this case the questioner started off, like that glorious drunkard in Dr. Halliday Sutherland's "Memoirs," with being "sair troubled wi' the schisms in Christ's kirk." He wanted to know what we wanted to do about the reunion of Christendom; but he never really discovered what he wanted himself.

Reading between the lines of such articles, it is fairly clear that what is wanted by such questioners is a combination of two things. First, they want anybody to say anything that comes into his head. Second, they want everybody to say the same thing. If they put it to themselves as plainly as that, their own common sense would tell them that there is no particular probability of these two things being achieved simultaneously by any human or secular policy whatever. Then they might begin to think; but unfortunately they never reach this stage.

Yet they are themselves at the moment in a quite intolerable transitional stage. A hundred years ago, when Protestantism was still strong, Protestantism was often proud of its divisions. Scotland with her thousand sects, England with her hundred schools of thought even inside the Church of England, openly boasted of such variety as a proof of vitality. On the other side, of course, are the Catholics; who are no more disposed than anybody else (but rather less) to bow down to the opinions of each other; but who hold that the truth of the world has been at least partly told by the Creator of the world, Who alone can know; and they therefore submit, *not* to each other, but to the truth.

Between these two positions wavers the bewildered symposiast, wanting to make all men agree, without anything that could possibly make them agree.

For the rest, he introduced us to various new topics, such as the Inquisition and the transparent simplicity with which the New Testament presents itself to those who have never read it since they were in the nursery. But there is one particular point which I should like to pick out for comment; partly because it was previously picked out by Dr. Inge, who still pursues his tireless intolerance in the *Evening Standard*; and partly because it was dragged in by the journalist in question, with rather more than the normal rambling and irrelevance of such journalism.

He put among his primary problems, for all the world as if it really were a primary problem, a reference to this particular matter to which Dr. Inge had referred, almost in the actual words of Dr. Inge. It is true that both he and Dr. Inge were repeating words now stamped and stereotyped by incessant repetition in the past. But both of them did, with slight variations of expression, repeat the statement that men of the medieval tradition could believe "that dirt is pleasing to God." The journalist seized on this, instantly recognizing that Dr. Inge is a real journalist.

Now one would think that people might try the experiment of thinking, in cases where their case would actually be stronger if they did. The true and intelligent definition of what asceticism really does mean would be quite as unpopular among the people they are addressing as this tiresome tag could ever be. It would not be much trouble to state the ascetic idea in an intelligent and intelligible form; but it would be intellectual trouble, and therefore they avoid it; and prefer the cliché they have read a thousand times.

Nobody ever said or thought that dirt was pleasing to God. If they had thought that, a lively mind could instantly suggest all sorts of curious and fantastic consequences. For instance, we should have splashed all white vestments with black mud, we should have thrown dirt about in the sanctuary and on the altar. We might have regarded a mud heap as in itself a mystical object of worship. The whole idea of the *lavabo*, of the washing of sacred vessels, of the keeping of ritual raiment pure and spotless, of a thousand things in the tradition back to the very symbol of Baptism—all these would have been displeasing to God.

What they are trying to say, in their groping and muddled fashion, is that, in certain cases and for certain people, discomfort was an approach to God. That would be quite good enough for their case, as for pagan demagogues attacking the Church in the age of paganism. The normal newspaper reader might be just as horrified at hearing

that discomfort could be holy, as at hearing that dirt could be holy. Only the first happens historically to be true; and the second happens historically to be rubbish.

Some saints gave up washing because washing is a great pleasure, and a perfectly normal and legitimate pleasure, in medieval times or any other times. Medieval romances, medieval descriptions of human pleasure, are full of washing. It is always mentioned by the medievals, as it was by the old pagans, as a simple and natural luxury. But these ascetics, for mystical reasons of their own, were giving up all luxury, even when it was simple and natural.

Now *that* is naturally a controversial matter in the modern world. It will really take us some time to explain, what is well-worth explaining, why a religion which is the defender of all normal things for normal people does believe that discomfort is the harder but the higher good for certain heroic people. But really it would be better for them, as well as better for us, if we could debate it intelligently without these jaded journalistic tags.

To say that anybody said, "Dirt is pleasing to God," is in fact a lie. But it is also a folly; it is exactly like saying that they said, "Hair is pleasing to God"; as if the mere sight of bristles or fur delighted the Creator, as if religion were equally served by fox or squirrel furs or muffs; when all the time what is meant is merely that ascetics wore hairshirts.

It is difficult to explain to heathens and hedonists why even saints should wear hairshirts; but anyhow they did not wear them because they worshipped hair. It is difficult to explain why they went without the luxury of baths; but the difficulty need not be increased by the baseless and senseless assertion that they worshiped mud. It seems to be a war between ideas and catchwords.

One last point is really important. Exactly *why* do these people talk claptrap about dirt, instead of talking common sense about discomfort? The chief reason is snobbishness. It is the nature of all snobs to sneer perpetually at a supposed dirtiness in their social inferiors; to call the people, whom narrow medievalists called God's Flock, by the name of the Great Unwashed; each person proving that an enemy is not a lady, or a "lidy," because of some association with the chimney-sweep, or any other honest fellow who cannot always be clean.

That, and that alone, is the reason why these controversialists concentrate on the word *dirt*, when even they would not be so silly as to concentrate on the word *hair*. If only they can convey that the saint is a low fellow like the sweep. . . .

REMEMBERED

New England claims the lilac-trees,
Through them evokes sweet memories
Of a cool, elm-shaded street,
White homes, withdrawn and primly neat;
Not of such, do these, my lilacs, speak
As now against their bloom, I press my cheek,
But of a wind-blown house
Upon a prairie, where
A lonely lilac lent its fragrance
To dust-laden air.

AILEEN TEMPLETON

The Higher Reaches

ELIZABETH SEHLSTEDT

IT was Greg's idea that we ask them for dinner. He said that they were Boston people who had been living abroad and that they were "full of ideas" and that we ought to know them. Greg does things like that. He picks up people wherever he goes and then he brings them to the rest of us to enjoy. Sometimes they are awful; then again they are more than worth the risk.

Once he brought a man off a train at eleven o'clock at night, whose name he had never heard but who (he said) possessed a "rare spirit." The unknown turned out to be a German university man with stimulating (if sometimes startling) ideas about everything under the sun, and a really amazing knowledge of early Italian painting. He stayed until three in the morning and the talk was superb. Then he vanished into the dawn and neither Greg nor we ever heard of him again.

On this particular night we were prepared for something rather special, because Greg had kept telling us that the new people were precisely the sort we would want to know. The man, it appeared, was a leading Catholic layman of the "advanced" school, a "brilliant mind." The wife, as far as I could make out, was chiefly beautiful and gracious, thereby supplying the proper background for her effective husband.

Accordingly we got in what we fondly hoped would be exactly the "right" people—the Catholic Actionist, the journalist, and three women who could talk amusingly and who had spent appreciable lengths of time in European countries.

The evening began too well. Common sense should have warned one that things could not go on like that. The Master, after years of experiment, has evolved a cocktail that *is* a cocktail, and all the traditional Marylandish food was at its best. The visitors grew lyrical over the oysters and Lisbon (who roasts a fowl as Leonardo painted a smile) had broken all her own past records on the ducks.

My soul was deliciously and smugly at peace. The talk was good, but not too good. No strain. No tension. Not overmuch sparkle. Everything was easy, spontaneous, mellow. "This," I said to my complacent self, "is the way it should be done; this is life at its simple best."

Then the thing happened. The Catholic Actionist was talking—something about St. Paul and Grace. I don't know. Anyhow the Bostonian took exception. He said: "But, my dear fellow, you can't really mean that, you know. The thing's impossible. It's heresy."

And the Catholic Actionist replied: "So! You call *that* heresy? Perhaps you're not familiar with Bellarmine on just that point. . . ."

"On the contrary," interrupted the Bostonian, and you could feel the atmosphere thickening, as it were, "on the contrary, I know very well what Bellarmine holds. It has no bearing here. Free will, I take it, means something altogether different. . . ."

Purposely or not, I shall never know, Greg upset a

glass of water. I began to feel ill. One of my rare goblets—very old and quite irreplaceable. Well, it didn't break, but the lady from Boston was drenched. To my dying day I shall remember that woman with gratitude for the magnificent unconcern with which she accepted the devastation of a really lovely frock.

Hurriedly I groped about my mind for some "safe" topic of general interest. I know Catholic Actionists; one keeps off certain subjects or one takes the consequences. I could see that Greg was edgy, too. After all, the Bostonian was his find, and he had bragged about him. Naturally, he felt responsible.

The journalist, who indulges a literary leaning, asked quite casually if anybody had read a certain recent criticism of Claudel's poetry. Nobody had and the journalist was encouraged to talk about it. I began to relax, while Greg and the Master fairly flung themselves into the conversation which presently became lively and general, about Claudel, about poetry, about modern French thought, about—oh, unhappy sequence! Before anybody realized it the Catholic Actionist and the Bostonian had got around to Jacques Maritain, to Grandmaison, to de la Taille, and the "depths" of French Catholicism.

I gave up. I'd done my best. Even the most conscientious hostess, I reflected, cannot wrest the conversational ball from a thoroughly determined speaker, and keep it lightly floating from one guest to another. Let those who must toss it back and forth between them. Maybe they would agree this time, anyhow; maybe it would be interesting, even. And they did, and it was, for a while. But they kept getting deeper and deeper. Pretty soon it was all so technical that only an expert apologist could follow them. The rest of us became listeners, bored or alert, according to our several natures. But we were definitely an audience (and an "enforced" audience) to

a highly specialized discussion. It was a little like sitting in on a directors' meeting or a physics examination.

In such moments humility is born. In such moments you learn new things about your own limitations. Perhaps you have been pleasantly comfortable in the consciousness that you talked well; perhaps you have taken for granted (modestly enough) your status among the agreeably cultured; you may even have thought that you had a "working mind," that you could make distinctions and occasionally score a point. Alas, if these be the sum of your claims, you have no place among the new laity. A mere arts-course, a few youthful years of scholastic philosophy (even), the enjoyed reading of a lifetime—these are paltry equipment with which to enter the Higher Reaches of Modern Lay Catholicism.

Theology (especially dogmatic); the latest philosophical writing (orthodox and unorthodox); disputed points which modern "ecclesiastical research" has brought up; these are the ordinary conversational traffic of the initiate. If you like it (more important, if you're up to it), you'll qualify; but it won't be easy. Make no mistake. Such conversation is not lightly sustained. It does not depend on quick thinking, or ready phrasing, or a surface knowledge of terms. It depends on work, serious and sustained. If it is well done (and here let me say, in all honesty, the particular Catholic Actionist of this narrative does it *very* well, indeed), it implies something very like scholarship.

But for most of us! Later that night, when they had all gone, and the Master was comfortably settled with his bed light and the fourth volume of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (vainly trying to "run down" an allusion of the evening) he paused in his reading to ask: "Well, good woman, what did you think of it all?"

"Think?" I repeated bitterly. "Why flatter me? Thinking is for the Higher Reaches."

The Last Stuart

CUTHBERT WRIGHT

NEAR the main entrance of St. Peter's Church at Rome there is a plain sarcophagus in the artfully simplified style of its period, with an angel or genius by Canova standing beside, and on the stone a Latin inscription in three lines stating that here lies the dust of James III, Charles III, and Henry IX, a father and two brothers, all Kings of England. The first two whose busts are represented in relief upon the stone are clad in the court or gentlemen's dress of the eighteenth century; the last is arrayed in the insignia of a Prince of the Church, a priest and king after the order of Melchisedec. This monument, once so popular a work of art, appears to be as forgotten now as the royal family it commemorates, the last of whom I propose to discuss here.

The cause of legitimacy appears to have been considered a dead issue before the World War, the latter having been thought indeed to have delivered it its *coup de grâce*. D'Annunzio in the 'nineties was enabled to write with regret: "Old legitimate sovereignties are everywhere de-

clining; and Demos stands ready to swallow the remaining ones down its miry throat." Yet the Bourbons are not forgotten in Republican France, nor the Hapsburgs in the former Austria-Hungary, nor the Stuarts in the Scottish highlands. In fact, I fail to comprehend why every English and Scottish Catholic is not a Jacobite at heart, if only in Queen Victoria's sentimental sense of the term, for among the Stuarts, one gave her life for the Faith, another sacrificed three thrones for it, and the last of the family lived and died in its priestly service.

He was the second son of the Old Chevalier, whom the Jacobites called James III, and of Clementina Sobieski of the great crusading line of Poland, a lady with some beauty and a great reputation for sanctity which did not prevent her from getting on very badly with her disheartened and melancholy spouse. James had several good qualities, but he was one of the least interesting of the Stuart family. Everyone knows now that he did not in the least resemble the dishonest caricature perpetrated

by that great literary fraud Thackeray in "Henry Esmond," and that he could have easily become King of England on the death of his half-sister, Queen Anne, in 1714, had he consented to change his coat and turn Anglican. But the "hope deferred," which he passed on to his sons, had rendered him permanently weary and heartsick, and a nervous indigestion caused him to quarrel incessantly with his family and entourage, including his wife and sons.

They were beautiful boys, at that time, wholly unaffected by their father's disillusion, especially Prince Charlie, and both were the objects of the utmost curiosity in the British colonies at Avignon or Rome. Like many family groups who quarrel with each other at the slightest excuse, they were at heart mutually devoted, the father to the sons, the brothers to each other. "Not for all the crowns in the world would he lose his boy, his Carluccio," said the King when Charles Edward set out for Scotland with eight followers on the gallant and disastrous expedition of the "Forty-Five." "Few brothers love as we do," said the Royal Boy Scout, alluding to the future light of the Roman Church. At that time, Henry showed no sign of his priestly vocation, though he was from the start sincerely religious, like most of his family.

Bonnie Prince Charlie! Not a decent schoolboy in English history but has read and thrilled to the account of how he landed with eight companions on the wild west Scottish coast, fired the loyal heather, advanced on Edinburgh, beat the experienced British commander at Prestonpans, crossed the border to the terror of Whiggish London, loved by his men, adored by the Highland chiefs, worshipped by the clans . . . and then turned back by the Butcher of Culloden, forced to flee to France, ready to begin all over next year, rejected by France, rejected by every court in Europe, discouraged by Pope Benedict XIV, exposing himself at the coronation of George III (as Walpole believed), offered a tentative crown by the Yankees, turning to alcohol in his declining years to drink away "the hope deferred," never forsaking his one Gleam till he died at Rome. And his brother who loved him, as the world loved, as we love him 150 years later, sang his Requiem with tears in his voice as they buried him under the Shadow of Peter. . . .

Our name the night may swallow,
Our lands the churl may take;
But night nor death may swallow,
Nor hell not heaven's dim hollow,
The star whose height we take,
The star whose light we follow
For Faith's unfaltering sake.

Henry was now a Cardinal, much to the anger of his brother who felt, not unreasonably, that if something should happen to himself, his brother's new dignity, so hateful in the eyes of most of the English, would finish forever his chances of succeeding to the Crown. It was hard enough under the circumstances to remain a Catholic, as he himself was, but to become a priest in a country where a priest was, to some extent, still proscribed, was the last drop in the chalice for the ardent youth. It was the subject of the only serious quarrel between the two

young men who loved each other till death. Henry fully comprehended the nature of his sacrifice, but this did not prevent him from continuing it in the completest terms. In 1748 he received the Diaconate from the Pope in person; on September 1 he was ordained and said his first Mass; in 1751 he made his first public appearance as Archpriest of St. Peter's, at the canonization of St. Jeanne de Chantal of France; ten years later he was enthroned as Bishop of Frascati, a small mountain diocese, not far from the Eternal City. According to Sir Walter Scott, this was a period of renewed Jacobite activity in Scotland, and this fact being grasped, one can appreciate the fulness of the unremarked sacrifice.

"So," one of his biographers writes, "the last Stuart prince settled down into the life that was given him, in exchange for his birthright, and the last page of the tragic Stuart history is the story of a happy life." It was not without its sunset clouds, however. The Old Pretender was not an easy man to live with, constantly bothered by dyspepsia, and worries over the perils and follies of Carluccio; and Henry himself had a hot pride, inherited from his Polish stock, though behind his temper there lay a great and enduring sweetness of character. Though the Pope and Horace Walpole did not concur, the burden of responsibility for the constant arguments seems to have lain with the father. Henry, for one thing, had the musician's temperament. It was his chief delight, while still at Rome, to rehearse Masses and motets in his titular church, Santa Maria in Campitelli, in the much loved company of his *kappelmeister*, Baldassare Galuppi, the subject of Browning's lovely Toccata, though Baldassare's toccatas are now only remembered for the sake of Browning's.

But when I sit down to reason, think to take my stand, nor swerve,
While I triumph o'er a secret wrung from Nature's close reserve,
In you come with your cold music till I creep thro' every nerve.

His father, rather than Baldassare's music, was responsible for Henry's nerves during that decade. James was so far English that he cared nothing for music and had scant sympathy for artists; in this respect the British would have had a King after their hearts had they taken him in 1715. He objected to his son's friendship with the composer, accusing Henry of a fondness for low company, a Stuart trait, which could never have been accurately said of the Cardinal-Duke. Thanks to an income from one or two abbeys, which he held in *commendam*, Henry was a fairly rich man at that date, and the Pretender experienced all the querulous agonies of the poor relation. A fresh cause of dissension was Henry's fondness for the youthful and charming Cardinal John Francis Albani, nephew to the late Clement XI, and Bishop of Ostia, whom James, born old, and never very charming, could not abide. The quarrel over this "minion," as Horace Walpole called the younger Cardinal, waxed so high that the Pope, who was fond of James, had to intervene on the father's side. Benedict XIV was personally one of the most delightful men who ever filled St. Peter's Chair, but he never seems to have appreciated the Cardinal of York. The result was that Henry had to forswear his

friend, but his enthronement a few years later as Bishop of Frascati gave him new and more pastoral interests.

Frascati is now the only place in the world, outside one or two Jacobite households, where the last Stuart is remembered. Wooded, green-cascaded, with the yellow campagna at its feet and the classic hills and lovely villages gleaming in the distance, the beautiful little mountain town is still fragrant with that gracious memory. He was one of the most religious of bishops, and the most generous. He so restored and beautified the town that its very stones still cry out with gratitude in the form of countless inscriptions bearing the purple thistle of the Stuarts; but his favorite form of almsgiving was not directed to monuments but to the pockets of the poor. Cardinal Wiseman in his "Recollections" records that at Frascati during the Bishop's residence there were next to no poor at all.

He still had a party in loyal Scotland. As late as 1786, the Episcopalian clergy there had debated whether they should be compelled to pray for George III in their liturgy. Nobody knew what might happen in three years time; if few foresaw the French Revolution, there were plenty who planned and plotted for a Jacobite restoration, and Henry was now the last of his race. But God moves in a mysterious way, and the next three years saw not the

restoration of the Stuarts but the fall of the Bastille. Italy was full of French refugees, and a few years subsequent the troops of Napoleon came down on the Eternal City like the wolf on the fold. Henry sacrificed almost all his large fortune in the service of the persecuted and exiled Pope, Pius VII, so that before his death he was constrained to accept a small pension from the Government of the Prince Regent, later George IV, kindly arranged for him by Cardinal Borgia, who was on good terms with His Highness' Protestant representative in Italy. This, and his subscription to the Stuart monument, are the two pleasantest things one remembers of Beau Brummel's "fat friend," if we except Shane Leslie's brilliant defense of the so-called First Gentleman of Europe.

The last legitimate King of England was also a great gentleman and a great priest; so he had lived, and so he died. In 1807, the splendid company of angels, the senate of apostles, the army of martyrs, the lilyed squadron of virgins, were evoked for the passing of his Christian and royal soul. "And mild and cheerful may the Aspect of Christ Jesus seem to thee. . . ." By a happy coincidence, as his body lay at the Cancellaria at Rome, Requiem and dirge were chanted in the nearby church of St. Andrea della Valle, so the Patron of the Purple Heather presided, in a manner of speaking, over his passing.

Catholic Action Coordinated

JAMES D. LOEFFLER, S.J.

CAN apostles be zealous without being jealous? The words, indeed, once meant the same thing and, although "jealous" has taken on an invidious sense, it can still be a virtue to be jealous for the things of God. Mingling the vice with the virtue in practice, organizations and individuals have frequently adopted attitudes prejudicial to the success of Catholic Action as urged and even commanded by the Holy Father, and these have been overcome only with difficulty in the various countries.

"Attempt to unite two Protestant churches and three result" is a common saying. In attempting to coordinate Catholic societies, it is almost too much to expect that grace should so conquer the tendencies of nature that there would be no trace of suspicious sniffings, if not rebellion. Most of the hesitancy and doubt so arising requires but greater illumination as to the nature and purpose of Catholic Action as expressed by Pius XI, and it will be dissipated. Unless, indeed, one should be so rash as to attribute an *arrière pensée* to the Holy Father himself!

We naturally assume in starting that the leading Catholic laymen of all countries are already affiliated with one or more societies belonging to the Church. To these societies they have given their pledges of loyalty and devotion and, even more practically, have contributed generously of their talents or wealth; to these societies they are united by bonds of interest and affection which are greater because of the spiritual values involved.

It could not be expected that men and women of this type would view other than with askance any movement which may appear at first sight inimical to the autonomy and prestige of the society of their predilection. Yet it is necessarily upon such laymen and women that the Church relies for the success of the new movement, anticipating that they will so broaden their vision, realize their strength, and extend their influence, that not one or other merely, but all good works, may profit by their zeal, talents, and distinction.

Strangely enough, perhaps, this does not mean that it is desirable that all Catholic organizations belong to Catholic Action properly so-called. Due to the wide publicity which Catholic Action has received, and the frequent pronouncements of the Holy See upon the subject, the opinion has prevailed that if persons or organizations did not belong to Catholic Action in the strictest sense of the term, they were somehow less Catholic, less approved, less desirable.

In addresses to members of various organizations, in acts emanating from official Congregations of the Holy See, in letters to members of the Hierarchy, the Holy Father has everywhere striven with visible effort, even devotion, to dispel this idea. Thus, for example, in a letter from the Cardinal Secretary of State to the President of Italian Catholic Action, we read:

Apart from Catholic Action in the proper sense, there is another disposition, union, undertaking, which consists in a marvelous multiplicity of structure . . . and is in truth a broad and real

external apostolate adapted to the piety of individuals as well as societies. This apostolate is exercised in all the varying forms of organizations which are suited to particular ends, but which for this very reason are distinguished from the proper Catholic Action. Hence these undertakings cannot be called Catholic Action without further limitation, although they can and must be designated as true and much to be desired auxiliary forces.

The use of the word *auxiliary* in this connection is in no sense depreciatory, as might be the case if we were considering distinct civil societies. The members of *one* body are all mutual auxiliaries for attaining the single purpose of the whole, and all are in some sense subordinate one to another. This consideration makes it increasingly clear why the doctrine of the Mystical Body has been termed "the theology of Catholic Action."

According to the Holy Father such works as those mentioned above not only can, but must, remain and perform their functions in and for the Church. In his address to the Sodalists on March 30, 1930, for example, he said:

Who is not against me is with me. . . . Each one must perform his part in every form of good; he must and shall help in this manner according to his strength, according to his training. One need not renounce his own special form, but on the contrary all these beneficent undertakings should remain. This does not mean that they should adopt another form of organization; also it does not mean that they are already in the literal and proper sense official Catholic Action. This merely means that all these external forms of good works can, indeed must, aid the central initiative of Catholic Action.

With Catholic Action they will not only work together in harmony and earnest cooperation and by this cooperation gain new strength, but Catholic Action shall on its part encourage such development in every way possible.

In fact, since it is not the intention of Catholic Action to supplant other organizations where they exist or to form new ones, one of the primary functions of Catholic Action necessarily is to provide such aid and encouragement. We can see, therefore, in what sense the groups which form Catholic Action strictly so-called must possess a definite precedence in the whole field of Catholic Action. From another standpoint they are rightly not at all so regarded: societies devoted to prayer, with purely spiritual ends, undoubtedly rank more highly than the groups of Catholic Action. Other organizations, which combine the spiritual welfare of the members with more active works of the apostolate as objectives, logically rank according to the stress laid on the higher ends. Briefly, in regard to all such groups, we may adopt no attitude or decision as to their greater or less accordance with the mind of the Church, for all are needed, just as there are states of life suited to the gifts and powers of all.

There is need for distinction, therefore, in the relations which various groups bear toward Catholic Action. In the first place, unions and confraternities of prayer, Third Orders, Congregations, etc., since they retain the essential nature of religious enterprise, not only do not comprise Catholic Action, but their activities do not even touch upon its primary mission. It is possible and desirable, however, that they should cooperate with this work, and in this connection Pius XI has spoken of the superior

training which such organizations afford for lay apostles, the future members of Catholic Action.

Specialized organizations devoted solely to education, poor relief, abstinence, vocational or professional development, and the like, have also been distinguished by the Holy Father (letters to Cardinal Bertram and Cardinal Segura) from Catholic Action in the strictest sense, and this despite the fact that they may be working precisely within the field of Catholic Action. This is due either to their exclusive application to definite, even detailed, functions, or to the fact that they possess a certain autonomy from Church regulation. Such organizations can and should *affiliate* themselves to Catholic Action, and may even be commissioned to represent the Church in their special sphere of its work.

Groups comprising this second class are those which may be called Catholic Action in the broader sense, that is, insofar as some dependence on the Hierarchy has been established, at least through the governing body. In political and other groups where this dependence cannot or does not exist, one may not speak of Catholic Action even in the broader sense.

Finally we come to Catholic Action properly so-called, and in the strictest sense. This grandest concept of modern times, inspired by the Holy Ghost and propounded by the Vicar of Christ, has gripped the hearts of men in every nation on the globe. Like the Church itself, its appeal is to the whole human race, which it wishes to include within itself, and to influence and form in the principles of Christian piety and justice. It would unite all men in universal amity; it would guide and inspire all men through noble leaders formed to the loftiest ideals; it would rally all men around those "centers of sound doctrine and multiple social activity" where they may work together in zeal and good will, coordinating and focusing their efforts that "all things may be restored in Christ," and that "the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ" may prevail throughout the world.

Since Catholic Action is designed as an aid to the Hierarchy, its structure must necessarily correspond to the hierarchical formation of the Church. The sturdy efficiency and smoothness with which the vast, divinely instituted organization of the Church governs men of all nations is a source of wonder to its enemies and pride to its members. It is the purpose of Catholic Action to extend the advantages of this system and order from the religious to the social apostolate, from the clergy to the laity who are already engaged in this essential work of our times, and to those who in the future must be increasingly occupied in it.

The unit is therefore the parish. As carried out in Italy and elsewhere, the plan provides a parish governing body, consisting of representatives of the four Catholic Action divisions: men, women, young men, and young women. With the approval of the pastor, the leaders of other organizations, even though not members of Catholic Action, may be called in to the meetings of the governing body, and their memberships affiliated to Catholic Action. The conditions are that they are following apostolic pur-

suits, and that the total membership of the affiliated does not outnumber the membership of Catholic Action itself.

Affiliated societies include primarily those of a social or economic nature; then also the charitable societies, vocational groups and special activities such as school or press. It is obvious that such an organization as the Sodality of Our Lady, with its broad apostolic program, direct subordination to the Bishop, and "sections" devoted to the various kinds of particular works, could be made to constitute the fundamental Catholic Action group of the parish, even though a closer spiritual direction and guidance of its members is implied. Insofar, however, as Sodalities, Third Orders, etc., are not identified with the parish groups, they may be invited to affiliate or cooperate with Catholic Action under like conditions.

The difficulty to be avoided is any appearance of factionalism which will lessen the influence of the parish establishment. The object to be sought is a powerful and unified apostolic flock, with all the members working in harmony whether in Catholic Action, or affiliated to it, or in cooperation with its endeavors, although excluded as groups on other grounds.

Thus grouped around the pastor these strong Catholic bodies are further drawn together in the diocese, as the hierarchical character of Catholic Action requires. Linked in this way, the Catholics of a whole diocese will be united in bonds of common endeavor and will form in fact a single great family inspired solely by the desire to share in the service and direction of the Church for the spread of the Kingdom of Christ.

Whether various societies and works are *coordinated*, either as essential parts of the general organization (the "strict" sense) or as *affiliated* groups (the "broader" sense), or whether by other means they attain the ends of Catholic Action, and so *cooperate* with it, in no case is there question of subordination or involuntary loss of identity or autonomy. Multiplicity of conflicting efforts and inharmonious guidance, dissipating the strength and dispersing the forces of Christ's army, is banished, and in its place arises a peace-bearing host of apostles, unified, disciplined, "an army in well-ordered array," worthy of Him in Whose Name and for Whose cause they struggle against the forces of irreligion. This is the meaning of Catholic Action!

Sociology

The New General-Welfare Clause

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

IT was R. Barry O'Brien, I think, who in his fascinating "Lord Russell of Killowen," told the story of an English judge obliged by unforeseen circumstances to sit on the Admiralty Bench. As he was not particularly conversant with admiralty law, his soul owned some apprehension, while his learned brethren before him quivered to their very wigs. But His Lordship put all but himself at ease by quoting—or misquoting?—as he opened his day:

And may there be no moaning at the bar
When I put out to sea.

It was with these words that I should have prefaced my remarks contributed to this page two weeks ago, under the title "Nine Old Men on the General Welfare." It was my purpose to show that the majority opinion in the AAA case had not "removed the general-welfare clause from the Constitution," as some snipers at the Court had claimed. It seemed to me that quite the contrary was true. As I read the Court's decision, along with the minority opinion, the whole bench had joined to affirm that clause and to enlarge it.

That fact seemed clear. But when one begins the attractive game of examining a fact in order to deduce from it other facts, one puts out to sea, and there may properly be much moaning at the bar. This is particularly true, when the facts deduced appear to be at variance with doctrine that has been generally received. It is not difficult to assimilate the Court's decision that "Congress is granted by the general-welfare clause a distinct power, apart from the other powers of the Constitution, to tax and to spend for the national public welfare." That decision completely

destroys the opinion of Madison, whose influence in the Constitutional Convention was so great that he has been styled "The Father of the Constitution," and replaces it by the opinion of Hamilton. But it can be accepted by the school of strict constructionists with no regrets save those that are merely sentimental.

When, however, we go further, and ask in what fields the Federal Government may spend money raised by its power to tax, we approach areas where even angels might fear to tread. Just as the Supreme Court has declined (in the Oregon school-law case, for example) to draw up a complete catalogue of all natural rights which the Constitution protects, similarly in the AAA case, it declined to "ascertain the scope of the phrase 'general welfare of the United States'" but contented itself with affirming that the scope was "great." The inference here is that some statutes plainly lie within the general-welfare power of Congress; others lie outside this power; and still others in a dubious zone. Those in the third class give rise to sharpest controversy, and can be decided with finality only by the Supreme Court.

Pursuing the inquiry, I ventured with some trepidation to point out several areas into which, as it seemed to me, the Federal Government might now enter. Congress might vote the farmers a bonus; or, supporting its plan for the limitation of farm products, purchase or lease lands, or grant subsidies for soil conservation. Congress might also assert a degree of control over industry of every type, over education, and over agencies for protecting the public health. In all these cases, it is assumed

that Congress will not by contractual or other instruments coerce or destroy powers which under the Constitution are reserved to the several States.

At this point, my conclusions appeared to go beyond all bounds. I had created a Frankenstein. I recalled what a learned Justice had said some years ago—in what connection I could not remember—that when conclusions so absurd can be logically drawn from a principle, we are assuredly justified in questioning the validity of the principle.

But since the meeting of the New York State Bar Association in New York last week, I breathe more freely. In his address on January 26, Stanley Reed, Solicitor General of the United States, asserted that the AAA decision may result "in an important line of decisions, validating Federal legislation in the field of agriculture, social welfare, and labor relations." The Solicitor General based this opinion on the section of the Supreme Court's decision in the AAA case which I had taken for my text; namely, its liberal interpretation of the general-welfare clause. He added:

Though I am one who most deeply regrets the result of the AAA case, I find very real cause for hope in the future in the language of Mr. Justice Roberts upon the welfare clause, and in the vigorous and cogent reasoning of the minority. Through the use of recognized powers of limited character, great functions of government are created. History may well repeat itself with the AAA case as a starting point. . . . Within the ambit of its delegated powers, the Congress is implemented to meet a host of varying national needs which govern a most substantial part of the national problem.

In the *Schechter* case, which set the National Recovery Act aside, the Court held that the Constitution "has proved to be adequate in every test of war and peace." Mr. Reed quotes this dictum, with approval, I take it, and believes that many social and economic problems of this day can be solved, to the extent that law can solve them, by use of powers possessed by Congress, and without recourse to Amendments. Congress may not attempt to regulate industry and agriculture by legislation of the NRA and AAA type, but it may achieve similar results by employing powers granted in the general-welfare clause. Good faith will, of course, be assumed.

This doctrine was also stated by another speaker at the meeting of the Bar Association, Dean Henry M. Bates, of the University of Michigan law school. Dean Bates believes that by its decision in the AAA case, the Supreme Court opened the way for an enlargement of Federal power the extent of which has not been generally realized. "The adoption by the Court of the Hamiltonian view of the welfare clause," said Dean Bates, "was a momentous step, the consequences of which cannot now be foreseen. The victory for the forces of conservatism may well prove to have been a pyrrhic one."

The concession [why concession?] of the Court in the AAA case that the general-welfare clause gives to Congress an independent power to tax and to spend, indicates possibilities of the vast control over commerce, manufacture, and agriculture itself, to which the limitations supposed to be set by the powers reserved to the States, or to the people, are likely to prove illusory. For it is common knowledge that Congress has vitally affected matters

ordinarily left to the States by the exercise of its taxing, commerce, post-office, and treaty-making powers.

It should be noted that the Dean perceives the possibility of a "vast control over commerce, manufacture, and agriculture itself," and that to these the Solicitor General adds, "social welfare." We may well consider schools of every grade, public-health agencies, and pension systems for the aged, for family welfare, and for the unemployed, as factors which are involved in promoting social welfare. I venture to think, therefore, that my conclusion, expressed two weeks ago, "appropriations for all these purposes are now constitutional," lies well within the bounds of probability. That control is not unlimited but the limits are disturbingly wide.

The wisdom of such appropriations is quite another question. One practical conclusion after reflection on the new general-welfare clause is that members of Congress must be selected with greater care. For the Supreme Court is not concerned with the wisdom of what Congress may choose to do, but only with the constitutionality of what Congress does. In yielding to the howls of an organized minority demanding the bonus, Congress has once more shown how easily it can be made to cringe. To know that a body of this low level of courage and intelligence has a new and less restricted control of the purse, induces uneasiness.

For the future we must choose men of another breed for Congress. Otherwise, through his control of the vastly larger patronage created by weak and unintelligent Congresses, some Postmaster General, faithful to the sordid traditions of his office, may make all elections pretty much what they are today in Mexico. The framers of the Constitution hoped that all public officials would use their great powers wisely. But the precautions which they adopted to overcast their hope with some hue of certainty now and then break down. Every Congress and every Postmaster General provides new proof of that sad fact. Some Congresses and some Postmasters General prove it up to the hilt.

CANDLEMAS

Slender and firm,
Whatever be its height,
Changing its body
Into heat and light,
The candle seems growing
From the candlestick,
As if an unblown yellow rose
Were poised on the wick.
Lord, like this candle
Am I, who aspire
To consume my body
In my spirit's fire,
Who from my mother's womb,
As beeswax from the hive,
Was shaped by Thy molding
To be with light alive.
Lord, in this candle
Here I stand.
Lift me from the candlestick,
Hold me in Thy hand!

ALFRED BARRETT, S.J.

Education

Reverence for the Child

• CRICKET WAINSCOTT

LONG ago I shuffled off my habit of attending conferences and conventions. As Harry Thurston Peck often used to say, one meets at them so many earnest persons in black trousers. But I wish that I might have heard an address given two weeks ago by Dr. Bernard Sachs, of the Academy of Medicine of New York, before the Regional Conference on Social Hygiene. "In child-study groups, altogether too much attention has been paid, and is being paid, to the question of sex—to the neglect of other far more important factors," said Dr. Sachs. "Much has been said about this over-sexed age of ours, but it is over-sexed chiefly in the amount of talk about it."

With that judgment I agree. My first acquaintance with Freud, to whose writings much of this flood of talk is due, was made in 1913, through an essay by Eduard Hitschmann, of Vienna, on "Freud's Theories of Neuroses." The Introduction by Edward Jones, then Associate Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Toronto, aroused expectations which Hitschmann did not satisfy, but which, ultimately, sent me to Freud. Not until two years later, however, was I able to obtain the first English edition (1913) of Freud's "The Interpretation of Dreams." About the same time, I came across a series of essays by S. Ferenczi, of Budapest, translated by Jones, and published under the title of "Contributions of Psychoanalysis." Studies by Bjerre, Brill, Jung, Adler, Havelock Ellis, and others less generally known, were later drawn on, and while I was never ready to accept Freud's essential position, I believe that my failure cannot be attributed to studied negligence.

Many of these writings were informative and nearly all of them were stimulating and provocative. Setting Ellis aside, it seemed to me, however, that a majority of the commentators blindly followed Freud, and that Freud himself was an enthusiast, rather than a pitilessly scientific investigator of the phenomena noted in his case book. I was never able to assure myself that what Freud accepted as fact was fact, and not something stamped by him as fact, not because of objective evidence, but because it squared with his theories. He seemed to be the victim of his will to believe. It may be admitted, certainly, that in the dark field which Freud set himself to explore, facts and conclusions from them cannot always be set down alphabetically, like the words in the dictionary. For a genius can in a moment leap to conclusions which only later laborious research can show to be true.

Still, if his conclusions are challenged, he should not complain. But Freud did complain, although not so loudly as his fuglemen. The influence which Freud and his school, despite their lack—in many eyes—of objectivity, soon exercised, grew to astounding proportions within a few years after the translations of his studies into English. In dilutions of varying strength, Freudianism was served

out to teachers in training schools, and by them was brought into the classroom.

From the outset it seemed to me that Freud read into childhood what is rarely found in childhood. I could not recall that my own childhood was occupied by sex conflicts, and what inquiries I have been able to make lead me to believe that my childhood was not unique. Children are more deeply interested in their meals, their games, and their toys, than in the "facts of life" interpreted by Freudians in a wholly sexual sense. Sex is not the whole of life, nor in childhood any great part of life. There are exceptions, but my complaint is that Freud turns the exception into the rule.

Yet extended courses in sex education have been prepared on the theory that the majority of children are filled with sex curiosity which, if not sated by anatomical charts and biological discussions (both often sadly inaccurate) leads to sex fears. Books which defend this assumption fill whole sections in our public libraries, and are consulted as oracles in teacher-training schools. Thus have the schools become over-sexed, mainly, as Dr. Sachs contends, because there is so much talk in them about sex.

Catholic schools have been accused of misunderstanding the needs of the child in this complex age, and of failing to armor him against temptation through courses in sex education. That Catholic schools have held aloof from this movement is, of course, perfectly true. In the Encyclical on the Christian Education of Youth, Pius XI writes:

Far too common is the error of those who with dangerous assurance and under an ugly term propagate a so-called sex education, falsely imagining they can forearm youth against the dangers of sensuality by means purely natural. . . . Such persons grievously err in refusing to recognize the inborn weakness of human nature, and the law of which the Apostle speaks, fighting against the law of the mind; and also in ignoring the experience of facts, from which it is clear that, particularly in young people, *evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of the intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions and unsupported by means of grace.* (Italics inserted.)

The Pontiff admits that for some cases instruction may be necessary. It may then be given privately by "those who hold from God the commission to teach, and who have the grace of state." But public instruction given to children indiscriminately, as it must be in a classroom, and based purely upon natural motives, he condemns.

What the Catholic school does is outlined, in some degree, by Dr. Sachs in his address.

Many groups, instead of spending hours on sex education, could spend the time more profitably, if they would consider how to develop in children absolute honesty, truthfulness, respect for authority, patriotism, and love of one's neighbor.

This is, in part, the program of the Catholic school. But the Catholic school endeavors to train the child to act upon motives that are supernatural. It puts before him "the means of grace." The child is trained to love God and his neighbor by positive acts. To serve God is not merely to avoid certain forms of conduct, but to acquire and strengthen habits. Chastity is growth, sustained by grace, in strength of character; unchastity is

not merely a source of physical disease, but something that weakens character, degrades the individual, and impedes him in the attainment of the end of his existence. He is taught that the difficulties which he may experience in the practice of chastity can be overcome by the use of such supernatural means as prayer and the Sacraments. It need hardly be said that in this moral training no worthy natural motive which can protect the child will be neglected. But he will never be led to believe that he can acquire self-restraint in this delicate matter by studies in hygiene and in anatomy.

Many advocates of classroom sex instruction seem utterly ignorant of human nature. I have in mind one text highly recommended for use in the eighth grade and in the first year of the high school. The authors describe certain physical acts in close detail, and then break off with the statement that these matters will be more completely explained at some later time. The first effect of such teaching is to arouse unwholesome curiosity. The imagination cannot be stimulated to a definite height, and then be bidden to stop short. Introduce this topic to adolescents in whom passion quickly flames, whose imaginations are unruly, whose characters are not yet formed, and the stimulus to unhealthy investigation, often ending in gross immorality, is created. Such sex education is a crime against that reverence which even the pagans taught must ever be shown to the young.

With Scrip and Staff

ONCE again Mrs. Gosling came to talk over the condition of her husband. Although I have not yet laid eyes on Mr. Gosling, I have a distinct picture of him in my mind's eye. He is a rather handsome man, though undersized. He is vigorous, though subject to varieties of ailments which express themselves chiefly in an alleged inability to work. He is sociable and gossipy. He is fairly intelligent, but is so convinced of his own uselessness that he cannot fix his attention long upon anything except bridge. And he is not a heavy drinker. Gosling is not of the quart-a-day variety. "Tom just likes a little highball now and then," says Mrs. G.; "but there are so many nows and thens. And when he doesn't get it, he is all broken up. He *always* needs it when I tell him about the warning my dear mother gave me when I married him." I did not ascertain just what this warning was, but I imagine it was in the nature of a prophecy. At any rate, its mention gives Gosling the creeps, and he must seek refuge in a slightly heightened euphoria. The question is: how to treat Gosling?

Charles H. Durfee, Ph.D., who writes in *Mental Hygiene* for January, 1936, on "Understanding the Drinker," would term Gosling a "problem drinker." In this therapist's view, "much of the current prevalence of immoderate drinking may be due not to the fact—authentic or not—that more alcohol is available, but to a more vulnerable level of nervous instability to which we are

subjected by modern life." Such a view, thinks Dr. Durfee, accords with the scientific stand generally held today that alcoholism in itself is not inherited, but "there may be inherited a constitution which finds it difficult to resist alcoholic stimulation."

Durfee believes that the issue is clouded by too much attention to the socially disturbing "heavy drinker." But the heavy drinker may not necessarily be the problem drinker.

To my mind the problem drinker is distinguishable, not so much by the quantity he drinks on occasion or over a period, as by the degree to which his drinking has become a personal and social liability to him. . . . What interests me, rather, is the effect of his drinking, not merely on his own mental and physical health, but on his whole social environment. . . . If, as a result of his habit, his health is endangered, his peace of mind affected, his home life unhappy, his business jeopardized, his reputation clouded, that man, if he cannot of himself stop his drinking despite his most fervent vows to do so, is in need of rehabilitation with the aid of an experienced consultant who understands the problem and who can help him to help himself.

Included in the problem-drinker class is the person who "habitually feels an urge to drink at certain times, as for example, after a round of golf." He cannot stand the interruption of his routine.

THE plan of therapy advocated by Dr. Durfee is based upon a composite and complete impression of the patient's personality gathered from what he tells of himself, from what is told by his friends and family with his consent, of course—"not only of his drinking, but of his general attitude towards life, his habits of work and recreation, his social relationships." It is necessary, too, to uncover his "innermost goals, ambitions, hopes, and yearnings—lofty, practical, unattainable, or misguided as they may be"—for these must be considered in finding a way of life that will give him ultimate satisfaction.

But the diagnosis is only a preliminary to the real task, which is that of re-education, an emphasis on the positive rather than the negative factors. Dr. Durfee does not believe in "cold turkey." In an atmosphere of freedom he finds that "it is the exceptional case who will not cease drinking entirely within three days of his own volition." In the same way he believes that to confront at once the victim of the drink habit with the prospect of total abstinence is "only to discourage him needlessly when he already is facing odds heavy enough."

Later, when he has arrived at a better understanding of himself, and when, over a protracted period of time, he has achieved a state of mind into which drink does not intrude as a problem, he will come to see of himself that in complete abstinence lies the only solution.

The basic plan is as follows:

Instead of stressing the alcohol, I endeavor to make life as full and active for the subject, utilizing all his constructive resources and personal capacities, that the problem of the alcohol is crowded out by other interests which act as substitutes for the glamour and ease formerly engendered by drinking.

To this already sound program the Church adds the relief of conscience through the Sacrament of Penance; the strengthening and stabilizing power of grace; the comfort and tranquility of prayers; the unification of life and

its ideals through the Christian philosophy of life; the direct healing power of the Sacrament of the Altar.

While Dr. Durfee does not rely as a means of reform upon the direct application of the moral issue to the over-use of alcohol, nor upon the influence of religious Faith and the grace that comes with it, I believe that many of his ideas can well be incorporated into a more adequate pastoral theory of the cure of alcoholism than has yet been elaborated.

THE Boy Scout movement is widely heralded as a powerful means for laying the foundation for a fuller and more satisfying life. Its program of self-reliance and self-development provides for later years some of those resources the lack of which lead to alcoholism and other disorders. Remarkable is the extent to which the French have adopted this movement that began in English-speaking countries. At the Congress of Catholic Scout Leaders held this January in Paris, Canon Cornette, Chaplain General of the French Catholic Scouts, stated that there are today more than 150,000 boys enrolled. The movement has spread to colonial France as well. There were 2,300 Scout leaders actually present at the Paris Congress.

Ralph J. Schoettle, special national Field Scout Commissioner, reports that among the former Boy Scouts out of four troops only, in Philadelphia, there are now eleven ordained priests and over forty seminarians. In Overbrook Seminary, Philadelphia, there are now sixty seminarians who were former Scouts in various troops.

THE PILGRIM.

Literature

Poland's Prophet of the Resurrection

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

FOR budding literary pundits a profitable investigation might be the part that the pulpit has played in the formation of modern literature, particularly in Catholic countries.

Suppose we studied the debt that French prose and poetry owes to Scripture, Old and New Testament, as quoted by the great French preachers of the seventeenth century. Language, subject matter, dramatic situations—all are debtors to the Bible. Similar studies could be made in Italy, Spain, Portugal. Yet none of these lands are associated with the Geneva gown and the altarless pulpit. If we wished to go back to the days of undivided Christendom, what an inexhaustible debt of imagery, language, and allusion is derived from the sermons of Augustine, Chrysostom, Leo II, and other great patristic writers; how much from the preaching of St. Antonine, St. Bernardine of Siena, etc. How much did Catholic Austria's literature owe to that original, Father Abraham à Sancta Clara?

This was still more true in the countries of Eastern Europe, where in the very early days the preachers Saints Cyril and Methodius set the example by inventing an alphabet for the Slavic peoples. In Hungary, Poland,

Bohemia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Latvia, White Russia, and other lands that separated the Teuton from the Russian, Catholic preachers and spiritual writers created, as it were, the national language; reduced its complicated sounds to signs, developed its power of abstract and scientific expression, gave it grace, periodic swing. They attached definite philosophical and religious meanings to definite words, so that these could be exchanged, in translation and conversation, with the languages of the West. Being close to the people they seized the genius of the language, and made it a vehicle of expression in some ways more plastic than the earlier developed modern languages of the West. And with it they developed a sense of literary form.

Such a creator was Peter Skarga, preacher at the court of Poland for twenty-five years, the four-hundredth anniversary of whose birth near Warsaw in February, 1536, Poland celebrates this month. Father Skarga was a conscious creator of his country's language and literature. A chronicler of his time relates of him, that "he was once asked, why he was always writing in Polish instead of Latin, when, if he wrote in Latin, he could gain a European reputation. Skarga replied, that he did so out of devotion to the language of his native land. His purpose was to give it form to the best of his ability, for the Latin language was perfected from of old; and since he was a Pole, he left Latin to others to take care of."

Bossuet has been called the "last of the Fathers of the Church." If vigor, prolific writing, and tremendous apologetic power are the requirements for that title, his Polish predecessor by a century might claim some patristic glory. Father Skarga's works are innumerable, from his first work (in Latin) "A Defense of the Holy Eucharist," written in Vilna against the Calvinist Andrew Wolan in 1573, to his year of death in 1612. He composed short and practical sermons for every Sunday in the year, defenses of the Catholic Faith against the Lutherans, whose advance he stemmed in Poland, sermons for various occasions, meditations and reflections prompted by the events of the time, popular prayerbooks, such as the "Soldier's Manual," and popular adaptations of standard historical works. It is said that he wrote every sermon two or three times before preaching it. He also took a discipline on his meager frame before preparing each sermon and article, which is a practice somewhat fallen into disuse in modern literary circles.

Skarga began his ecclesiastical career as a secular priest, a canon of the cathedral of Lwów (Lemberg), where he refused to hold two benefices at the same time. He entered the Society of Jesus under St. Francis Borgia in 1568, and in 1570 was appointed confessor for the Poles in Rome by Pope Pius V. After his return to Eastern Europe the following year, his ministrations were not confined to what is now Poland. His first work was to save the tottering Faith in Lithuania, and he founded colleges in Riga (today Latvia), and Dorpat (present-day Estonia). In Poland he worked ardently for the reunion of the Oriental Churches. According to the Polish *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* for February, 1936, to

which I am indebted for many of these details, Skarga would not allow himself to be intimidated by the Polish magnates, took up the cause of the Orthodox Bishops who sought reunion with the Holy See, and sent them to Rome with letters from the King of Poland himself. Later, in 1597, Skarga wrote in two languages, Polish and White Russian, in defense of the Synod of Brest, where by the famous Act of Union in 1596 the Eastern Rite dioceses of eastern Poland and western Russia were united with the See of Rome. King Sigismund III, in his proclamation relative to the Union, maintained the rights of the former dissidents against the jealousy of certain of his noblemen. And Skarga in this instance, as in so many others of his life, showed his independence of the magnates. For he was a man of the people.

Our time deeply appreciates the fact that Skarga was a social as well as a religious apostle. On October 25, 1584, he gathered together in Cracow seven prominent persons, and laid the foundation simultaneously of two extraordinarily successful institutions, the "Brotherhood of Mercy" and the "Bank of Piety." The latter, a credit institution for the needy, was the duplicate of Pope Paul IV's *Monte di Pietà* in Rome, which Skarga had studied in former years; and was the predecessor of the Raiffeisen banks or cooperative credit unions of our own times. As "Poland's St. Vincent de Paul," and a forerunner of Frederic Ozanam, Father Skarga worked out a set of "statutes" for his Brotherhood, provided it with reading matter, and insisted that its members should give two sets of alms, one weekly, and one whenever their hearts prompted them. Finances of the Brotherhood were placed under strict supervision; while its membership was absolutely democratic. The King himself, big nobles, artisans and tradesmen, rubbed shoulders together in the Brotherhood. Centuries did not succeed in destroying Skarga's charitable work, not even the World War of our days.

The most dramatic episode in Skarga's life, depicted by the Polish historical painter Jan Matejko, took place at Cracow in the Cathedral of St. John: his sermon before the Sejm or Diet of the Realm. His words on that occasion were probably the most terrific and eloquent denunciation of a nation, its rulers, its people, its manner of life, that any court has ever listened to. They were a prophecy of impending ruin, and the prophecy was fulfilled, for the words were not heeded.

Skarga began with a passionate profession of love for his country, "as God commanded us to love our own mothers." But he saw no love for that mother among her sons. Then came the prophecy of ruin:

The enemy will come from abroad, made bold by your disagreements. He will say: "Their heart is divided, they are ready to perish. We will devour them, their feet are slipping, they cannot escape us!"

And your divisions will lead you into exile, where your liberties will be submerged and turned into ridicule! . . .

Not only will you be without a ruler of your own blood and without power to elect one, but you will also be without your own Fatherland and your own kingdom: exiles, forever destitute, despised, indigent, vagabonds, who will be kicked about by the first person that sees you! . . .

You will serve your enemies in hunger and thirst and nakedness and in every form of want. They will lay an iron yoke upon your neck, because you have not served the Lord God in the joy and happiness of your heart, when you had an abundance of every good.

Plunged in agonizing silence there sat before Skarga in the sanctuary of the Cathedral King Sigismund III; Anna Jagiellonka, widow of Stephen Bathory; the Crown Prince Wladyslaw; the Papal Nuncio; Cardinal Maciejowski; the Chancellor John Zamoyski, and other magnates and senators of the realm. The horror of the picture deepened as the orator, with flaming eyes and vivid gestures, described the crimes of the nation, the robberies, attacks on churches, murders, grinding of the poor, breaches of trust, and so on. Then came the mysterious prophecy of the Resurrection.

God is merciful, said Skarga. If we do penance, He will hear us. "If I were Isaias . . . if I were Jeremias . . . if I were Ezekiel . . . if I were Jonas . . . I would preach penance, as they did. God will wound our hearts with sorrow and He Himself will heal the wounds, as the prophet says: 'He will give us life and after two days on the third day He will raise us up!'" The first day would be a day of grief and sorrow, the second, one of repentance and emendation, the third day one of restoration to righteousness.

The prophecy of three days is now interpreted as applying to three centuries. In the eighteenth century Poland was partitioned among her enemies. In the nineteenth, she was scourged for her sins, and in the twentieth as a nation she was again united and restored to a vigorous and hopeful life.

Be that as it may, Skarga was a creator and a prophet. Personally, I can believe in his greatness because of his humility. In the last months of his life, when too feeble to do more writing and preaching, he did sewing for the novices' cassocks and helped the sacristan pour candles. They had to do some persuading to make him receive the Holy Viaticum because his sickness kept him from making his full hour of meditation.

The Poles are moving the cause of his beatification. I hope they succeed. We need some more writer saints, and some literary creators who create, and some prophets whose prophecies come true, and who are humble enough to sew cassocks!

THE UNDISCERNING YEARS

Oh, to think that I was but a child,
Too small, too young, to understand or feel
The loneliness you wore, the grief you hid,
The agony that racked you on its wheel.

Oh, to think that I who should have helped you
Was blithely blind those undiscerning years;
Surely I could have poured for you some solace,
Of mine have made companions to your tears.

And now at last I feel and understand,
Now I am strong: alas, you could not wait;
The eager gifts I could, I should have brought you,
Are mine to give, but they are late, too late.

PAULA KURTH.

A Review of Current Books

Romantic Showman

BYRON: THE YEARS OF FAME. By Peter Quennell. The Viking Press. \$3.50.

AT the age of twenty-three Byron awoke one morning to find himself famous. The popularity of *Childe Harold*, which, as Mr. Quennell observes, was "perhaps nothing more than a freak of fortune," was the immediate cause of his renown. After its publication Byron was the showman of the Romantic movement. One of Byron's theatrical temperament would likely have been a showman in any setting. That the poet's literary success enlarged the circle of his admirers was mere accident; obscurity would not have fundamentally changed his character. Indeed, Byron could be, and was, theatrical even within the privacy of his closet. He was, says the author, "the first English writer whose personal life, opinions, and alleged private habits evoked a degree of curiosity nowadays reserved for film stars, famous athletes, and other heroes of the popular daily press," all of which was certainly quite in keeping with the young Lord's tastes.

Mr. Quennell's book is not a biography but rather an intensive study of the five fantastic years of fame which Byron enjoyed before his disgrace and flight from England. The author reveals a thorough understanding and penetrating insight into his subject. Students of Byron will be indebted to him for the study.

With the arrival of fame Byron began acting in good earnest for his "public." He deliberately cultivated the melancholy look; he led doting women to think that he was even more wicked than they knew; he dressed with an almost feminine elaborateness. Nor was this all: his naturally auburn hair, on which he not infrequently used curl-papers, he dyed to a jet black; he constantly took purgatives to preserve the exquisite texture of his skin; he dieted rigorously to keep down his avoirdupois. The great mortification of Byron's life was his lameness, to conceal which he developed a peculiar, though not ungraceful, gliding walk.

Mr. Quennell gives a splendid picture of the social setting in which Byron moved at the height of his fame. The psychopathic George III was confined in his palace as a lunatic, while the inept Prince of Wales, who was later to be George IV, governed the country. Under his social leadership, a decaying royalty and the *beau monde* in general frittered away much of its time in scandalous dissipation.

Any estimate of Byron must be tempered with charity. He was the descendant of an erratic and erotic line; his tactless mother, altogether devoid of an equable tenor of life, one moment caressed the boy and the next taunted him with being a "lame brat." Certainly some of the excess in Byron's life sprang from the fact that he was the uncontrolled son of an uncontrolled mother.

THOMAS J. LYNAM.

The Martyred Poet

ROBERT SOUTHWELL THE WRITER. By Pierre Janelle. Sheed and Ward. \$3.50. Published January 15.

ONCE again we are indebted to French scholarship for a noteworthy appraisal and investigation of a major English literary figure. Professor Janelle has written a book which commands praise on many grounds; his work is the first complete critical survey of Southwell's poetry and prose, the first accurate statement of all the facts known of Southwell's life, and the first to set forth a theory of Southwell's literary importance in the development of English literature, an importance which is made good for all time against the ignorant pronouncements of the elder school of English criticism. When it is said that the book is as readable as it is scholarly, praise is exhausted.

The life of St. Robert Southwell, priest of the Society of

Jesus, martyred for his Faith and priesthood in the year 1595 by the conspirators who then ruled England, is a poem in itself, rich in devotion and self-sacrifice. In his account of Southwell's life, the author brings out very clearly that dual allegiance which plagued the minds of Elizabethan Englishmen; either true to Church or true to King. Many a one clove zealously to one side or to the other; the great majority tried to balance between. The martyr was son of such a man, a wealthy, time-serving squire of gentle family and noble connections, who vacillated between an inner conviction of error and the desire to save the family property. St. Robert Southwell had none of his father's prudence in worldly affairs; boldly he lost all to gain all, and was received into the Society of Jesus, passed the necessary time in study, was ordained and returned secretly to England as did others of his Order, eager for souls. Professor Janelle bears testimony to the sweetness of his soul and the elevation and sweep of his intellect. That martyrdom he sought was his at the end, and he was executed after long torture and imprisonment.

The legend of his constancy and personality had great effect in his own times, but it is with his body of literary work, both verse and prose, that we concern ourselves today. The publication of this work was of necessity disorderly, issued from secret presses and largely posthumous; hence the work of the bibliographer and textual critic had to be assumed by the author as well as that of interpretation. Every scrap of Southwell's writing was devoted to the ends of his religious mission and so the work of interpretation was comparatively easy. It has remained for Professor Janelle to make discoveries and draw conclusions that place Southwell's work much higher in the scale of literary achievement than even Catholics had formerly regarded it. Unfortunately, James Russell Lowell's prestige was so great that even his stupidities have the force of authority and his ignorant pronouncements on Southwell have set the fashion up to now.

The documentation is thorough and the bibliography almost exhaustive. The account of Southwell's own works is very valuable; however, in the case of the first edition of *Marie Magdalen's Funerall Teares*, Gillow was quite correct in assigning the date as 1591. Only one copy of this edition survives and it was sold at the dispersal of the Hoe Collection in 1912. Reference to the Hoe catalogue will settle the point.

It is to be regretted that the book was printed in France. The list of errata is long and examples of careless proof-reading abound on almost every page.

J. G. E. HOPKINS.

A Frustrated Christian

LAFAYETTE. By Andreas Latzko. Doubleday, Doran and Company. \$3.00. Published January 31.

LAFAYETTE has not been fortunate in his biographers. Owing to the fact that he tried to steer a middle course between saving the monarchy with all its old privileges and setting up a government of the extreme left, he pleased nobody and gave scope for many from both ends of the social scale to write him up unfavorably in the lying memoirs composed after the revolution had run into reaction. Hence the source material at the base of many accounts of Lafayette makes an unfortunate account almost necessary.

Andreas Latzko has shown good judgment in quoting liberally from Lafayette's own letters to Washington and others. Even if Lafayette is a bit inclined to magnify the picture of himself, still it is a true picture. Though not a practising Catholic, though steeped in the hard, brilliant, and often shallow maxims of that low-water mark in the history of the human intellect, the eighteenth century, still he seems to have been an honest man who hated avarice, loved his wife and children and friends, and sincerely believed that the proposition, "all men are equal," was self-evident. That the equality of men is a Christian dogma but not at all a pagan or after-Christian dogma never seems to have

come near his mind. If you had told men in the latter eighteenth century that human equality was flouted by the greatest intellects of antiquity and that slavery is native to man outside of that central European thing which once was called Christendom, they would have smiled at you. For they were a little proud of their ability to quote a tag of Horace or an epigram of Seneca just before the guillotine severed their heads.

Of all this "age of reason," whose philosopher was one of the softest sentimentalists that ever splashed ink on paper, of all this vague deism and denial of that message which the Creed conveys, Lafayette was full to the brim. It accounts for many of the disappointments of his life. He was forever thinking that a mere recital of the doctrine of the rights of men was enough to make the aristocrats part with their privileges or the leftists part with their blood lust. In truth, this eighteenth-century philosophy was the opium of the people just as truly as Communism is the opium of the Russians today.

We cannot but admire Lafayette for fighting in behalf of this Christian thing which is liberty. But it makes us sad when we realize that all his tarrying in Austrian jails did not burn into him the idea that liberty is a Christian thing. If it were a human thing and not a Christian thing the Austrians would have praised him instead of putting him in jail. For nobody denies that the Austrians were human.

Within the framework of these limitations of his, Lafayette was a great man. I have enlarged on these limitations because the biographer does not mention them. He thinks that Voltaire was a great intellectual powerhouse and he uses the adjective "medieval" as a term of contempt. Lafayette's tragedy was that of the frustrated Christian. If he could have foreseen all the dictatorships that ply the knout over European men today, and even grind down our Mexican brethren across the Rio Grande, he would have seen that they labor in vain who try to reconstitute human society without Christ and without the Church He founded.

ALFRED G. BRICKEL.

Alunnists in the Lunniverse

SCIENCE AND THE SUPERNATURAL. By Arnold Lunn and J. B. S. Haldane. Sheed and Ward. \$3.00.

IF phagocytes could talk—let us suppose they go further and broadcast over a national network—an interesting situation might arise, says Arnold Lunn in the course of these debates on science, religion, atheism, evolution, and miracles between an agnostic bio-chemist and popular lecturer and an ex-agnostic ski-racer and also popular lecturer. Some of the phagocytes in the corpus of Mr. Lunn, who could be termed Lunnists, might "believe that the Lunniverse in which they live is controlled by a mind. The others are firmly convinced that only superstitious phagocytes could possibly believe that the phagocyte does not represent the highest form of intelligence in the vast Lunniverse." The crucial test would come when an operation for appendicitis is performed, which the Lunnists explain by the intervention of an outside cause endowed with a mind, while the Alunnists "express their unshaken confidence that these facts will some day be explicable in terms of a scientific law which will one day be discovered."

The difficulty of the controversy is thus stated by Mr. Lunn: "Evolution, as we have seen, is *de fide* for the atheist, but an open question for the Christian. We do not need to disprove Evolution to disprove or to discredit atheism, but it is clear that atheism could not survive the refutation of Evolution." This inability to yield an inch lest he open the fortress to all onslaughts of the spiritual betrays Mr. Haldane into a very uncomfortable position. Discomfort increases as the argument proceeds, and some of Haldane's serenity begins to wear off under Lunn's thrusts and jabs. However, the tourney, though it comes near to an untimely end, perseveres according to contract, and Mr. Haldane, recovering some of his poise, sticks it out to the finish.

Lunn's ability as a controversialist is undisputed. What of the

practical value of such a debate? The advertisements lend an unfortunate coloring to the book's purpose, by announcing that a materialist will be a still better materialist after reading them, though the theist will come out strengthened in his convictions. Taken literally, this would seem to remove the book from the Catholic category altogether, and place it furthermore in the class of forbidden books. According to the prescriptions of the Church, if erroneous ideas are to be stated in a Catholic work (as done by St. Thomas Aquinas), their refutation should be evident to any reasonable intellect, and should naturally tend to convince even an unbeliever. This issue has already been raised in an ecclesiastical periodical concerning Lunn-Haldane.

I think, however, that the blame can be placed more upon the blurb than upon the book itself. A superficial reader might be impressed by Mr. Haldane's wisecracks and appeals to current substitutions, in the pseudo-scientific work, of dogma for hypothesis. If many readers were to be of the superficial variety, this might still be ground enough for objection, since it is as grievous to mislead the superficial as to mislead the profound. But that type of mind will scarcely delight in *Science and the Supernatural*. No one will get beyond the first chapter or so unless he can concentrate his mind upon the arguments, which is by no means easy, since in this circus five or six rings are going at once. This reflection may get Lunn-Haldane under the wire with the Canon Law. Besides, other debates, such as Pope and Maguire, Ryan and Hillquit, have been published in the past, I assume with ecclesiastical sanction.

A part from these considerations, it is good to see how the Catholic doctrine of the supernatural can face hammer blows in the realm of fact and theory, neither taking nor asking quarter.

JOHN LAFARGE.

Shorter Review

SURVEY OF A DECADE. By Maximus Poppy, O.F.M., and Paul R. Martin. B. Herder Book Co. \$3.50.

POPE LEO XIII when seeking for a means by which to bring about social reform and put new vigor into Christian living exclaimed: "I have found it in the Rule of the Third Order of St. Francis." There was no need for starting anything new, for right at hand was the simple Rule of the Third Order Secular, which could be understood by high and low alike, the means by the use of which the Catholic laity could aspire to Christian holiness of life. And so in this beautifully produced volume of more than eight hundred pages some idea is given of how great the Order has become and how it has taken on the proportions of a vast movement, a great Christian army founded on the love of God. It is the kind of book that should find a place in every Catholic parish library in the United States and Canada. That it will be found in the homes of the countless thousands of Franciscan Tertiaries may be taken for granted, since this is a recapitulation of the progress of the Third Order Secular of St. Francis in the United States. His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate contributes a Preface; and the book closes with two valuable Papal documents in English translation, the Encyclical *Auspicio* of Leo XIII, September 7, 1882, on St. Francis and the Third Order, and the Apostolic Constitution of the same Pope, *Misericors Dei Filius*, May 30, 1883, revising the Rule of the Third Order.

The Survey is mostly taken up with the history of the foundation of the Third Order in the United States, and with detailed reports of the Second and Third National Congresses of the Tertiaries. Under the heading "Papers of Reference" are given the rules of the organization; a compendious list of points for reflection; and an extensive and up-to-date bibliography that covers every possible phase of Franciscanism, and is a treasury of information. It is obvious, considering the expensive format of this volume and the extremely low publication price, that it must have been produced at a loss. It is to be hoped that the wide circulation it deserves will convert any deficit into a profit. W. H. D.

Recent Non-Fiction

THE OUR FATHER IN GETHSEMANE. By Francis P. Donnelly, S.J. This is by far one of the most beautifully bound and illustrated devotional manuals that has come to our notice in some time, the author of which is well known for his "Grains of Incense" and other books. It contains thoughts for the Holy Hour developed from the Our Father and treats of the sufferings of Our Lord conceived as living and enacting the Our Father in His Agony, with each phrase of this great prayer expanded and applied to the Passion. This little book is suited to mental prayer, visits to our Eucharistic King, and the Holy Sacrifice. (Hirten. \$1.00.)

VIRGIN MOST POWERFUL. By Martin A. Beehan. This little volume of fifteen chapters is meant to serve as meditation material on as many virtues corresponding to the respective mysteries of Our Lady's Rosary. The devout Faithful will find them practical in spiritual suggestions. The author makes no pretense at originality and has gathered his material from various sources, but it is for the most part interesting, pointed, and instructive. (Kenedy. \$1.00.)

YOU, UTILITIES, AND THE GOVERNMENT. By Ernest Greenwood. In this book the Administration's power program comes under heavy fire from one bitterly antagonistic to its aims. Mr. Greenwood was a member of one of the State bureaus of public-utility information some years ago; the association has apparently flavored his writing. Some of his points are well made, but violent attacks and half-truths result in an inevitable lack of confidence. (Appleton-Century. \$2.00.)

Recent Fiction

THE JEW OF ROME. By Lion Feuchtwanger. Flavius Josephus, Roman citizen, historian, Jew (in the order named), if not a hero, as that word is best understood, is at any rate protagonist in this scholarly writer's sequel to his earlier *Josephus*. The book is historical fiction, breathing an atmosphere of great reality by reason of the excellent characterization and thought in translation of a successful attempt to speak in modern phrasing. Many readers will be impressed by the author's skill in portraying the temporizing vein in Josephus. Certainly none can remain unmoved by the last few pages wherein the Jew of Rome marches beneath the Arch of Titus, thus exposing himself to the scorn of both Jew and Roman, yet saving his skin. Though his narrative is slow-moving throughout, especially in the fourth part, Feuchtwanger is always dramatic enough to win readers with whom fictionalized history of the ancient Roman Empire has lately become popular. Published January 2. (Viking Press. \$2.50.)

WHITE HAWTHORN. By Lucille Papin Borden. A story of love, human and Divine. The novel is quite definitely historical, but not ponderously so. Casual readers will not find it difficult going. Mrs. Borden is at her artistic best when she is at work in a comparative study of sin and Grace. The characters are superb. Fiorenza will dance into your heart. Mysia will moisten your eyes, if you are not very careful. The Valettas will make you bristle. Italy itself is beautifully done. Lucille Borden quite evidently loves it—sun and moon, sea and sky, lady and urchin. The novel will be a choice gift for someone you think a great deal of. (Macmillan. \$2.50.)

ARTHUR LEE. By the Rev. Thomas P. Phelan. The author of this volume portrays priestly life in the United States as lived in the person of his hero, Arthur Lee. Though fictional in form its incidents are factual, most of them from the author's personal experience. Older readers will be inclined to have Canon Sheehan's classics in mind by way of comparison and contrast and will not find Arthur Lee up to the distinguished Irish priest's stories. The book, however, makes a readable and edifying story of clerical life that will benefit both our clergy and laity. (Kenedy. \$2.00.)

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Mexico

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It seems to me that in the efforts to aid our persecuted Mexican brethren we have neglected the most important instrument—prayer. Would that the value of united prayer and supplication were fully realized! If from Portland, Me., to Portland, Ore., and from Duluth to New Orleans the call had gone forth for prayer during a certain week or period; if the Knights of Columbus had organized a national series of public meetings of protest at which both Catholics and non-Catholics could have been invited and enlightened; if they had followed up with the appointment of a committee on publications in every district to keep the public and press informed about the latest developments; if the Catholic press, the secular press, and the radio had been used to the fullest extent; and lastly, if adequate financial assistance had been appealed to for the thousands of refugees, especially the clergy and Religious; if these things had been done, it is my conviction that the Congress and the President would have taken steps to put an end to the intolerable conditions prevailing in that unhappy country, because the pressure would have come from the great mass of our people, regardless of religious affiliation, who still love truth, justice, liberty and fair play.

It can still be done. Will those in authority take the lead in this much-needed crusade to battle the hosts of Satan? We owe it to our Mexican brethren in charity, if not in justice, because we as a nation are largely responsible for their present misery. For twenty years we have aided and abetted their oppressors, many of whom are of such character that in large sections of this country they would be strung up the nearest tree.

I hope to see this matter taken up and debated—and acted upon.

Springfield, Mass.

RICHARD LENZI.

Unemployment

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Below is an excerpt from the Sachs Quality Furniture advertisement in the New York Times of January 1:

Unemployment is a national disgrace. The way to solve unemployment is to put people to work. . . . The only group who can put them to work are the employers. I propose that each and every employer in America increase his personnel to the extent necessary to take up every employable person. . . . And it should be done immediately. Sachs Quality Furniture, Inc., pledges itself, if employers in our community will cooperate, to immediately employ additional personnel, at prevailing wages, to the extent of 25 per cent of our present organization.

It seems that Mr. Sachs realizes just where the sore spot is. Persuading the merchants and manufacturers to see the light is the difficult part of the matter. They look to their individual trade associations and finally to the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce for guidance and trade customs. Those who conduct the associations seem to think that their members will not think they are doing a good job unless they place obstacles in the way of realities and constructive liberal approach to these realities. Just as Mr. Breen has done much to direct the moving-picture industry away from the dirt that the industry thought American audiences wanted, so a liberal individual with a forward outlook as to employment and wages over the years and with authority to direct the minds of the members of the individual associations could accomplish much.

Manufacturers and merchants worry about what their com-

petitors are doing. If it became trade custom to keep sufficient help and pay just wages so that unemployment and debt and poverty would be outlawed and buying power kept at a maximum, the majority of those employing help would eventually fall in line. There are sufficient Catholic manufacturers and merchants who, if they could be made to see that this may be the sound way under the existing social order and made to realize that the unemployed will become an increasing difficulty in one way or another to the functioning of a country designed for the welfare of all the people, would lend themselves to a concerted effort toward making their associations appreciate the necessity of taking the matter of unemployment into their own hands and finding a way out, which could become the policy of all associations and followed by the members. Catholic action among our own people, persuading them to influence their trade associations, might be the means of starting a movement which would in a large measure care for the unemployed. Catholics as a body appreciate this position because of the words of Pope Leo and Pope Pius. Let those of us who are employers impress our competitors with the practical value to them of our approach to this problem, and the responsibility of unemployment can be placed where it belongs.

New York.

FRED C. STRYPE.

A Member of the Body

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I, please, register in your Communications Column a complaint which has been a source of bewilderment to me for some time?

On three occasions, after having subscribed to certain Catholic papers or magazines, I have received these addressed to: "Rev. Daniel J. Connolly." I am only a worker and can't help feeling embarrassed when I am addressed so. But I have thought of a possible explanation. I've read that I am a member of the Mystical Body of Christ and that the vitality of Christ is poured into me as a result of our union. So without any more ado I began to sign my name, after a complimentary closing, "in Christ." I did this in all my letters for several months.

Now it would seem that convention insists that only priests or Religious have this privilege! Why? I do not like to accuse those in religion of being guilty of monopolizing this phrase and yet it is essential that this misconception be broken down if Catholic Action is to go places in our fair land.

Hence this hand grenade: I accuse those in religion in our country of monopolizing the right to live consciously in the state of grace, and with St. Paul I say: "And the eye cannot say to the hand: 'I need not thy help'; nor again the head to the feet: 'I have no need of you.' Yea, much more those that seem to be the more feeble members of the body are the more necessary."

New York.

DAN. J. CONNOLLY.

Clerical Atheists

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Protestantism was given a severe jolt the other day when a group of Protestant clergymen signed a statement which advocated birth control. Judaism also suffered a severe setback when several rabbis stood for the same thing. That Cardinal Hayes was attacked for no other reason than that he very clearly stated the Catholic position, based on the natural law that is written in the heart of every man and the supernatural law that Scripture definitely teaches, was not a little surprising; one would have thought that the age-old position of the Church on this subject would have been known to these divines.

What was really appalling was the fact that this group of Protestants and Jews so completely forgot themselves as to discard the One Supreme Personal Being before Whom all creatures are as nothing for the "God that is revealed in the endless sweep of evolution." This statement is out-and-out pantheism. Even the Scriptural God is "ancient myth and legend." This reads like a page from the Spinoza of Amsterdam. This pronouncement re-

duces the Protestant and Jewish faiths to a mere philosophy that was advocated by Heraclitus in the dim ages of Greek philosophic thought and found untenable by the sage of Stageira in the golden age.

We fondly hope and earnestly pray that the group that so unjustly attacked Cardinal Hayes and so unwittingly played into the hands of confessed materialists, are but a minority of those that profess the Protestant and Jewish faiths.

Detroit, Mich.

(REV.) E. A. LEFEBVRE.

Loyalty Oath

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read, with the profoundest satisfaction, your Note and Comment (AMERICA, February 1) on the taking of the loyalty oath. You state that "No true American . . . reasonably objects to taking an oath of loyalty to the Constitution of the United States."

Politically, I am a subject of His Most Excellent Majesty, King Edward VIII (at this writing); but I have enjoyed the gracious hospitality of the United States for an appreciable time, and I can think of nothing that would give me greater happiness or arouse in me more sincere sentiments of loyalty and affection than being constrained, voluntarily or involuntarily, to take the oath of loyalty to the Constitution of the United States.

New York.

W. H. W.

Horace

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In a recent number of the *National Geographic Magazine* Father Coleman Nevils tells us: "During the past months there have been Horatian pilgrimages elaborately carried out, and in other countries as well as Italy unusually brilliant exercises have been held commemorating the two-thousandth anniversary of the year 65 B.C. when Horace, the popular classical poet, was born." AMERICA for December 7 promised us: "The bi-millenary celebration of the poet Horace will be celebrated next week" by an article in its columns. May I point out that the two-thousandth anniversary of the year 65 B.C. falls in 1936? There was no year 0. A man born in 1 B.C. would have his first anniversary in 1 A.D.; his second in 2 A.D.; his nineteen hundred and thirty-fifth in 1935. A man born sixty-four years earlier (viz., in 65 B.C.) would have his nineteen hundred and ninety-ninth in 1935, and his two thousandth in 1936.

Toronto, Ont.

W. BURKE-GAFFNEY, S.J.

Ushaw

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am writing the story of my life, dwelling particularly on my experiences as a writer, and today I went to the Public Library to look up certain things connected with Ushaw College where I spent six-and-a-half years. To my surprise I could find nothing about Ushaw at all. Since Ushaw is the successor in England of old Douai College, which was founded by Cardinal Allen in France in Elizabethan times, and since Ushaw, established in Durham during the French Revolution, is old and important in its own right, this lacuna is a rather serious matter. Of course I know there are references to Ushaw in certain biographies but I would be obliged to any reader of AMERICA who would refer me to any book giving a little more detail. My address is: 138 East 37th St., New York. And if this number of AMERICA should reach the eyes of the authorities at Ushaw, may I ask them, if they can, to send to the New York Public Library back numbers of the *Ushaw Magazine*, and copies of any books on Ushaw they can spare. I can of course get enlightenment from Ushaw itself, and I expect to do so, but I can't think at once of all the things one would be likely to want to know about in the course of an autobiography. Perhaps back numbers of the *Ushaw Magazine* may be consulted somewhere else in New York. I would be thankful if somebody could enlighten me on this point.

New York.

BENEDICT FITZPATRICK.

Chronicle

Home News.—On January 24, in a brief, 206-word message, President Roosevelt vetoed the baby-bond bonus bill. He referred Congress to his message disapproving a bonus bill in May, 1935, and stated: "My convictions are as impelling today as they were then. Therefore I cannot change them." Forty-five minutes after the message had been delivered, the veto was overridden by the House, voting 324 to 61. On January 27 the Senate voted 76 to 19 to override the veto. On January 29 the President submitted to Speaker Byrns of the House formal supplemental estimates of funds needed to meet the bonus. He requested Congress to provide a total of \$2,249,178,375 to finance the bonus and necessary expenses for carrying out the Act. The House Foreign Affairs Committee reported out the Administration neutrality bill on January 28. On January 29 the Senate Committee on Agriculture voted 15 to 2 to report favorably the Administration's soil-conservation legislation. Chairman Smith of the Committee said that he and several other members had "grave doubts" as to the fundamental legality of the bill. The political pot began to boil on January 23, when Senator Schwellenbach made a sharp attack on the American Liberty League. On January 25 Alfred E. Smith, speaking before the American Liberty League in Washington, attacked the New Deal for "the arraignment of class against class." At the outset he made it clear that he was not a candidate for any office. He read several planks from the 1932 Democratic platform and contrasted them with the performance of the Roosevelt Administration, adding: "What we want to know is, why wasn't it carried out?" His speech was bitterly attacked in the House and elsewhere. On January 28 Senator Robinson gave the Democratic party's official answer to the speech, claiming that Mr. Smith had specifically endorsed many of the acts and principles of the New Deal which he attacked. On January 29 Mr. Smith declared that Senator Robinson's address was intended merely to becloud the issue and that "there is only one man" who should try to answer him. Senator Borah opened his Eastern campaign for the Republican nomination on January 28 in Brooklyn. Governor Landon of Kansas opened his campaign for the same objective on January 29. At Macon, Ga., on January 29, 3,500 Southern Democrats repudiated President Roosevelt and called upon Governor Talmadge to run for the Presidency. On January 27 the President named six of the seven members of the new board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to take office February 1. Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the present Board, and M. S. Szymczak were reappointed. The others were Joseph A. Broderick of New York, John McKee of Ohio, Ronald Ransom of Georgia, and Ralph W. Morrison of Texas. The Federal Reserve Board's adjusted index of industrial production advanced to 103 in December, the highest since the Spring of 1930. On January 28 Secretary Wallace,

referring to the mandatory refund of \$200,000,000 of processing taxes under the Supreme Court decision, called it "probably the greatest legalized steal in American history."

Mexican Events.—On January 27 the Mexican Hierarchy made public an open letter to President Cárdenas, dated November 23, 1935, and signed by all Archbishops and Bishops. The Hierarchy denied the governmental viewpoint that the Church enjoyed religious liberty. They petitioned for restoration to Catholics of all churches seized or closed since 1914; abrogation of laws limiting the number of priests allowed to officiate in each State; and restoration of church annexes to permit installation of offices and homes for priests. They asked that the Secretariat of Education be ordered to prohibit teachers from giving anti-religious instruction and that anti-religious propaganda be removed from the schools.

British Yield on Battleships.—One of the most crucial differences between British and American naval policy yielded yesterday to the discussions that have been pursued at the London naval conference since the departure therefrom of the Japanese on January 15. A new British plan, as proposed at the conference by Viscount Monsell, First Lord of the Admiralty, accepts the existing 35,000-ton limit on battleships which the United States has always demanded. In addition, it requires only slight reductions in the size of gun caliber of other types of warships. It will be recalled that the British until very recently consistently held out for a much lower limit on battleships and guns, varying from 25,000 to 27,500 and 30,000 tons. Battleship ordnance in their plan is to be reduced from sixteen to fourteen inches. Building of "A class," or 10,000-ton cruisers, is to be halted during the term of the agreement. Light cruisers would be limited to between 7,500 and 8,000 tons, with 6.1-inch guns. A powerful lever in obtaining this concession from Great Britain was thought to be the action of Italy in building two 35,000-ton battleships, and France's intention to follow suit. Before, however, the British proposal can be accepted as entirely reasonable by the Americans, our delegation would decide whether it wishes to accept the British reduction in gun caliber and the size of aircraft carriers. Disturbing reports were current in London that Italy intended to bring up at the conference the question of fleets in the Mediterranean.

Italian Victories.—Italian press dispatches of January 24 reported 8,000 Ethiopians had been killed and 4,000 taken prisoners in a fierce battle on the northern front. In the Galla Borana territory General Graziani, Commander of the Italian southern forces, issued a proclamation announcing the abolition of slavery. The Italian victory at Deidei is said to have completely routed the army of Desta Demtu, once the regal lord of Southeastern Ethiopia from Lake Margherita's rich valleys to the wild game veldt of Dolo. The smashing drive of the motorized Italian army conquered in rapid succession the towns of

Deidei, Modale, Filtu, Godgod, and Noghelli. A distance of 250 miles was under Italian control. On the other hand, claims of victories by the Italians in the north around Makale and in the south around Noghelli have been denied by dispatches coming from Ethiopia. Ethiopians admitted, however, that Ras Desta Demtu withdrew his troops from the northern regions of Dolo to the hills of Noghelli.

Further Advances.—On January 26 the Associated Press reported that Italian forces had advanced beyond Noghelli with the intention of capturing Allata, a large city of Sidamo Province and a point of strategic importance, as it not only controls all the principal Ethiopian lines of communication between Addis Ababa and the south but also dominates a broad valley of great lakes forming an accessible avenue of approach to the Ethiopian capital. The planned attack on Allata was dropped because the remnants of Desta Demtu's army were reported to have been reinforced by contingents from neighboring Provinces who were holding both mountain passes leading to Allata. The Italians were said to have gained remarkable success at weakening the morale and coherence of the armed strength of the enemy by encouraging tribes hostile to the rule of Haile Selassie. This is made possible by the fact that Ethiopia is not a unified state but a loose grouping of hostile Provinces and tribes.

New French Cabinet.—On January 24 Albert Sarraut succeeded in setting up a Cabinet basically Radical-Socialist but with representatives from both the Left and Right groups that promised to give it stability. Its chief feature was the appointment of Pierre-Etienne Flandin as Minister of Foreign Affairs, with Joseph Paul-Boncour as Minister of State and delegate to the League of Nations. Flandin's selection indicates a pro-British policy. The Rightist press expressed strong opposition to the Cabinet personnel, especially Flandin. The latter went to London for the King's funeral with President LeBrun, but it was expected that before returning to Paris he would seek to solve the French financial crisis in exchange for trade favors. The new Cabinet faced the Chamber for the first time on January 30 and, as was anticipated, received a majority vote.

Premier Resigns in Greece.—Climaxing a week of intense political excitement which began with the Venizelist victory at the elections on January 26, Premier Demerdjis resigned three days later and King George asked the Venizelist leader Themistocles Sophoulis to form an all-party Cabinet. The elections, the first since the restoration of the Monarchy and conducted with perfect order, honesty, and liberty, were for 300 seats in the National Assembly, the contestants being seven major and nine minor parties with 1,668 candidates. Results showed that the anti-Venizelists gained 143 seats, the Venizelists 132 seats, and the Communists 16. The election was a defeat for Field Marshal Kondylis, though he himself outran former Premier Tsaldaris. Speculation

was rife as to whether Venizelos himself would be permitted to return. The returns for the Communists gave Greece the largest number of Red Deputies in her history. The Greek party also is the only officially recognized Communist party in Southeastern Europe.

German Religious Situation.—The pastoral letter drawn up at the recent Bishops' meeting in Fulda and ordered to be read from all Catholic pulpits throughout the Reich, recalled the obligations assumed by the Nazi Government under the Concordat with the Vatican, signed by Chancellor Hitler, saying in part: "When we again proclaim prohibitions it is far from our intention to touch the State or party in the matter of state or party publications or organizations. For we know that the state as well as the party must be true to its duties assumed in the Concordat and must be strongly opposed to the misuse of their organs for attacks upon the Church and the Christian Faith." This was regarded as an appeal to the Nazi party to cease its anti-Catholic propaganda. The Bishops called attention to attacks on Catholicism in newspapers and magazines and in the Nazi instruction courses. Answering Rosenberg's slur that Christianity had brought slavery to the German people, the Bishops declared that Germany first assumed its place as a leading nation when Christianity freed it from "pagan darkness."

Nazi Leader Answers Bishops.—Baldur von Schirach, Reich Youth leader, responding to the Catholic pastoral attacking anti-Christian propaganda in the Nazi ranks, declared: "To be a nation is the religion of our epoch." Conversations between representatives of the Catholic Church and the Nazi regime concerning the Concordat were said to have been scheduled. Four Catholic Bishops, it was reported, would confer with Hanns Kerrl, Minister of Church Affairs, together with an Interior Ministry representative and an agent from the Reich Propaganda Ministry, in an effort to reach an understanding on interpretations of the Reich-Vatican Concordat. These negotiations were interrupted nineteen months ago after Catholic leaders had been slain by Hitler guards. Another breach in the Concordat, the Nazi campaign for non-sectarian schools in Bavaria, was called to the attention of Minister Kerrl, by a commission of Catholic Bishops. Bernhard Rust, Minister of Education, issued an order forbidding public schools to co-operate with religious libraries. He forbade Catholic schools to employ space in school buildings for religious library purposes. Church Minister Kerrl seized the funds of the Protestant pastor, Rev. Martin Niemoeller. The split in the Protestant Confessional Church was reported healed, both groups agreeing it was justifiable for individual Protestant leaders to negotiate with Minister Kerrl.

Fourth Nazi Year Begins.—January 30 marked the beginning of the fourth year of Chancellor Adolf Hitler's absolute control of the German Reich. With a rapidly growing army and navy and a powerful air force already in existence, Germany entered its fourth year of National

Socialism as one of the world's leading military powers. The Reich Air Ministry announced that a German delegation would journey to Washington to confer with American authorities on the establishment of airlines between Germany and the United States.

Riots in Syria and Egypt.—When the French authorities closed the Nationalist clubs in Damascus and Aleppo, serious rioting broke out in both cities. Eight of the demonstrators were killed in Damascus, while 250 persons were thrown into jail in Aleppo. The University students took the lead in the anti-British disorders which continued to occur in Cairo as a result of the Cabinet crisis in Egypt. When the Wafdist (Nationalist) students attempted to hold a "council of war" at the college, the police squirted them with indelible ink from an "ink gun." Fifty-six students and twenty policemen were injured.

Danzig Dispute Settled.—Great satisfaction was experienced in Geneva at the success of the League of Nations Council in bringing about a settlement in the dispute between the Nazi Government of the Free City and the League of Nations administration. A resolution of the Nazi Senate of Danzig called upon the Senate to respect its democratic constitution. Various discriminations in favor of the Nazis and against the Opposition, which had gained forty-three per cent in the recent elections, were revoked. Chiefly instrumental in the League's obtaining this concession was the firm attitude of Joseph Beck, Poland's Foreign Minister, who had been unwilling to take a decisive stand against the Nazis. At the same time, Danzig remained exposed to its standing danger of economic absorption by Poland, and political absorption by Germany.

Soviet-Uruguay Relations.—As an aftermath of the League of Nations action reported last week relative to Uruguay's rupture of diplomatic relations with Moscow, the South American press generally assailed the League. A special committee appointed by President Vargas began an investigation in Brazil of the November revolt and the extent to which Communists were involved. Mr. Litvinoff's address to the League Council was viewed as meaning that the Soviet Government was trying to mask South American Communist activities and fighting hard for a ruling that League members could not sever diplomatic relations without attempts first at arbitration. It was also believed that Mr. Litvinoff was trying to separate Soviet Government activities from those of the Communist International. Meanwhile in its issue of January 25 *L'Osservatore Romano* asked, "What does the League think of the equivocal juridical fiction evolved from Moscow and unmasked by public opinion, namely, that the Soviet Government refused to have any connection or responsibility with the Comintern, executive group of the Communist International?"

Warning of Archbishop Downey.—Addressing the

annual conference of the Catholic Teachers' Federation at Liverpool, Archbishop Downey warned his fellow citizens that it would cost the country \$10,000,000 to replace the Catholic secondary schools. He estimated that there were in England and Wales 1,239 Catholic elementary schools, with 412,793 pupils. It was noted that from 1902 to 1930 the number of Anglican schools had declined by 1,535. Archbishop Downey intimated that the burdens proposed in the Hadow plan to raise the school-leaving age to fifteen would prove excessive to the Catholic people.

Juvenile Crime in North Ireland.—Lack of religious education was seen as the principal cause of the increase in juvenile crime in the Six Counties of North Ireland. According to the annual report of the administration of the northern Ireland Home Service, there has been a "remarkable rise in the number of male offenders committed in 1934, as compared with 1933, or indeed any previous year. . . ." It has been stated by Protestant clergymen that at least 100,000 of the population of Belfast never set foot inside a church except for the celebration of Orange Day, July 12.

Burial of King George.—Amid scenes of unprecedented public mourning George V was laid to rest in the vaults of St. George's Chapel, sanctuary of the Knights of the Garter. Five Kings, the President of France, a score of Princes, Ambassadors, Ministers, and military leaders from all quarters of the globe marched with King Edward and his brothers behind the gun carriage that bore the body. The final benediction was imparted by the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York.

New Cabinet in Egypt.—The prolonged Cabinet crisis was settled by the selection of a non-party group on January 30. Aly Maher Pasha was charged with forming the Ministry, which included Ahman Abdul Wahab Pasha (Finance); Hafez Hassan Pasha (Public Works); Hassan Sabrey Bey (Communications, Commerce, and Industry); Mohammed Aly Pasha (Justice and Religious Foundations); Aly Sidky Pasha (War and Marine); and Sadek Wahba Pasha (Agriculture). The Premier himself will retain Foreign Affairs and the Interior.

With the closing of the polls of the plebiscite intended to determine who are the greatest living Catholic authors, AMERICA will announce, next week, the inauguration of a competition in poetry. A first prize of \$100.00, and a second prize of \$50.00, will be awarded to the two best poems on Our Lady.

A poignant, masterly appeal is that made by Jaime Castiello, S.J., in his article, "The Message of Guadalupe," to be published in our next issue.

"Broadminded Bigotry," by Victor Luhrs, examines the hypocrisy of modern liberals, in the liberal manner, but without hypocrisy.

Inflation? What are the chances against it? Gerhard Hirschfeld will discuss the problem.